

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06824681 2

John Lincklaen



Cazenovia, N. Y.

*Presented by*  
*Mrs. S. C. Fairchild*  
*to the*  
*New York Public Library*

ZFHF  
GRAY









**THE FIEND  
OF THE  
REFORMATION  
DETECTED.**

**PART I.**

***PRICE ONE DOLLAR.***



THE  
**FIEND**  
OF  
THE REFORMATION  
DETECTED.

**PART I.**

THE TWO SOPHISMS DETECTED,

Which have split the Reformers into Calvinists, Arminians, Redemptional  
Universalists, &c.

**PART II.**

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE PRESENT STATE OF THE REFORMED  
CHURCHES;

Their Controversies—Sermons—Theological Seminaries—Some of the chief  
Causes of their Divisions assigned—and some Hints suggested,  
respecting the Cure of their Schisms.

---

BY JAMES GRAY, D. D.

---

“Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord.” HOSEA.

---

PHILADELPHIA :

PRINTED BY W. BROWN, PRUNE-STREET.

1817.

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

104360

ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.  
1898.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

THE author is extremely sorry that he should have to apologise to his subscribers, for offering them only half the work he so lately promised them. But to effect more at present, is impossible. The exhaustion occasioned by intense application during this scorching season, and two very violent attacks of sickness, have so much reduced his animal vigour, that he must have some relaxation.

At the same time, each part of this work forms a complete whole ; and the SECOND PART shall appear as soon as the author's health will permit him to complete his manuscript.

*Philadelphia, August 11, 1817.*



## CONTENTS OF PART I.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

The History of Mr. M'C.'s Controversy.

#### SECT. I.

	PAGE.
That man is a representative animal . . .	6

#### SECT. II.

Of Adam's representative character . . .	9
Proofs of the fact . . . . .	10
Two questions.—1. The formal consideration in which men were viewed in the covenant of works.—2. The bond which connects them with Adam in the cove- nant . . . . .	11
Jesus Christ not represented by Adam—and why .	12
Eve represented by Adam—and why . . .	14
Comparison of Eve and Jesus Christ . . .	18
That Adam did not know all his posterity . .	20
That God did know all Adam's posterity, and included them by name in the covenant . . . . .	21

	PAGE.
That there is no covenant of works but that mentioned —Gen. ii. 17 . . . . .	23
Insolvable questions . . . . .	25

### SECT. III.

Representation by Jesus Christ.—Proof of an eternal covenant of grace . . . . .	32
Grace given to men in Christ Jesus, before the world began . . . . .	37
That some men must be saved . . . . .	39
That the number to be saved is fixed and definite .	42
Why Mr. M'C. has neglected to enquire whether there is an eternal covenant of grace . . . . .	44
That Mr. M'C.'s system admits no eternal covenant	46

### SECT. IV.

Of Christ's righteousness . . . . .	48
A work on sophistry much wanted . . . . .	49
Danger of premature generalization . . . . .	51
That Jesus Christ obeyed the precept, as well as suffer- ed the penalty of the law, for men . . . . .	52

### SECT. V.

Does the <i>imputability</i> of Christ's righteousness depend on his representative character . . . . .	53
Various systems of theology formed on the affirmative of the above questions—54, Universalist—55, Ar- minian—57, another sect—58, another—59, another	
That Mr. M'C. assumes the affirmative of the above question . . . . .	60

### SECT. VI.

That the <i>imputability</i> of Christ's righteousness does not depend on his representative character . . . . .	62
---	----

	PAGE.
Proof . . . . .	54
Of the nature of a remedial law . . . . .	66
The reason why the <i>imputability</i> of Christ's righteousness has been ascribed to his representative character . . . . .	69
Mr. M'C.'s system consists of a word without a meaning . . . . .	72
Of the nature of the unity between Christ and believers . . . . .	72
Mr. M'C.'s theory worth nothing . . . . .	75

## SECT VII.

The universality of the gospel call . . . . .	76
Anecdote of the council of Nice . . . . .	77

## SECT. VIII.

Gospel call.—Mr. M'C.'s system does not allow the gospel to be preached to any sinner . . . . .	79
---	----

## SECT. IX.

Of the capaciousness of the covenants . . . . .	81
---	----

## SECT. X.

Of the individualising system . . . . .	12
Mr. M'C.'s ideas on the subject so peculiar, that nobody ever adopted them . . . . .	84
The belief of the church, respecting the individuals who were placed under the two covenants . . . . .	85
No absurdity in this belief . . . . .	88
Of the reformation and reformers . . . . .	90
Probable origin of Mr. M'C.'s system . . . . .	91
Character of the advocate of truth . . . . .	92
Character of the investigator of truth . . . . .	94
The danger of Calvinists becoming philosophers . . . . .	97
The causes why Calvinists have not been good moral philosophers . . . . .	98

	PAGE.
Character of president Edwards . . . .	99
The troubled state of the churches . . . .	100
An address to young preachers . . . .	101
Moral systems, and their origin . . . .	102
The grand error of the reformation church . .	105
The main doctrine of the reformation church . .	106
Preaching the philosophy of christianity, is not preach- ing christianity . . . . .	111
An address to theorists . . . . .	112

## SECT. XI.

The author's reward for his trouble, two pickles of chaff	114
Strictures on the manner of preaching the gospel .	115
That the fiend has out-generalled the clergy . .	118
What is the use of the doctrine of original sin . .	121
A troublesome problem for the clergy . . . .	123

## SECT. XII.

The reason why salvation is offered to all men .	124
The half-bred metaphysician . . . . .	128
No reason for the imputation of Adam's sin to his de- scendants, but the will of God . . . . .	129

## SECT. XIII.

Comparison of philosophers with divines . . .	130
The reason why philosophy is advancing so rapidly— while theology has continued stationary for ages	
CONCLUSION . . . . .	134



## INTRODUCTION.

IN the year 1814, the Rev. James M'Chord, of Lexington in Kentucky, published a book denominated the **BODY OF CHRIST** ; the object of which was, to exhibit a new theory of Christ's REPRESENTATIVE character in the covenant of GRACE, and of Adam's REPRESENTATIVE character in the covenant of works ; and to demonstrate the beneficial practical results of that theory. Neither the theory, nor what Mr. M'Chord deduced from it under the name of practical results, were satisfactory to the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky, of which Mr. M'Chord was a member : so great was their displeasure with Mr. M'Chord's publication, that they preferred a libel against him, containing charges against both the theory, and the results, imputed to it, by its author ; which bears date, Lexington, Oct. 13th, 1815. Under this libel Mr. M'Chord was eventually found guilty, and deposed from the office of the holy ministry. He protested against the sentence, and appealed to the General Synod. Papers containing the protest and appeal, and extracts from the minutes of the Presbytery, were laid before the Synod at its meeting in Philadelphia, in May 1816 ; but, as the whole matter was in a very perplexed state, and Mr. M'Chord not present to plead his own cause, the Synod directed him to submit to

the decision of his Presbytery, till he should appear, and shew cause why that decision should be set aside. Mr. M'Chord appeared before the synod at its meeting in May, 1817; and the Synod, after hearing the defence, affirmed the sentence of the Presbytery in regard to the THEORY ALONE, rejecting the other charges as irrelevant. Mr. M'Chord protested against this decision of the Synod, and has appealed to the judgment of the Christian church at large.

In a circular letter, directed by Mr. M'Chord to many, and to myself among others, bearing date Lexington, Kentucky, 12th Sept. 1816, Mr. M'Chord uses the following words:—"The opinions I hold up to the light of Heaven; shew me that they are erroneous, and I cheerfully relinquish them." As the Synod has pronounced the charges against Mr. M'Chord's sentiments respecting CHRISTIAN COMMUNION and PSALMODY irrelevant, nothing need be said on these subjects; and I candidly own, that they ever have been my own sentiments, and I have long been in the habit of acting on them, whenever the providence of God appeared to me to require it as a duty. And I do not think this an officious declaration of these sentiments, because all the world should know, that we are not disposed to surrender to any authority the liberty by which "Christ has made us free"—the liberty of submitting our consciences to no authority but his own: and of knowing no law of duty but his law, which is the perfect law of liberty. Those who know their conscientious liberty should be open and candid, but at the same time, modest, in asserting it. The THEORY alone is at present in question, and I consider Mr. M'Chord as addressing himself to me personally in these words: "*Shew me wherein I am wrong, and I cheerfully relinquish*

*my opinions."* I do know WHEREIN he is wrong, and I consider myself in duty bound, both as a Christian and as a man, to comply with a request so Christian and so manly. The duty also is strongly enforced by this consideration, that although it has been decided, both by presbytery and synod, that Mr. M'Chord is wrong, yet no person, so far as I have heard, has yet attempted to shew him WHEREIN is his error. And it now becomes Mr. M'Chord's duty to listen candidly and patiently, and to divest himself, so far as the state of humanity admits, of all fondness for his past opinions, that he may *so* listen, to what I am about to offer him. It is his duty, not only to be willing to admit the light, but to pray earnestly to the Father of lights for the spirit of illumination; and to take as much trouble, to submit to as much labour, to know the *right* from the *wrong*, as it has cost me to write this volume.

I enter upon this subject, with the stronger impressions of duty, when I consider that this is the error which has split up the reformed churches into so many parties, of Calvinists, Redemptional Universalists, Arminians, and a numerous list of other sects, as the reader will find in the sequel; and has converted them into hostile clans, carrying on a perpetual war on each others borders, too much in the spirit, and with too many of the effects, of a *bordering war*, the embittered strife of brothers. The present subject is not new to my mind, but I have never been called in providence before, to trouble the church, sufficiently troubled already from other causes, with my ideas on this subject. And without such a call, they should have gone to the grave with me.

After this declaration, the reader will have prepared himself to move along with me, in the cool temper, and

slow pace of analytic investigation. We shall march with perfect composure, and in perfect good humour, without one malicious thought towards any human being, intent only to reach the object of our journey, TRUTH. So taking up our staves in our hands, "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord," let us move forward.



## PART I.

---

### *The Two Sophisms Detected.*

THE reader who recollects the operations of his own heart under the ministrations of the gospel, knows—and the reader who is acquainted with the opinions of other men under those ministrations knows, that the doctrine of Adam's representation, and the consequence of that representation, original sin, on the one hand ; and the doctrine of Christ's representation, and the consequence of that representation, imputed righteousness, on the other hand—are the ground on which sinners stumble and fall, many of them to rise no more. And even those who at last stand firm on this ground, have obtained their stability in consequence of much tottering and falling. The reader of ecclesiastical history knows, that the two doctrines before stated, are the ground on which most of the schisms and heresies which have taken place in the Christian church, have originated : that, on this ground, sects, each of which have retained the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, have departed from each other in ill blood, and each taken its several way, accusing the others of dangerous, and even damning errors. Yet every one of them believed the Scriptures to be the word of God ; and admitted that every decision of God in his word, ought to be taken as a first principle in all our religious argumen-

tations. What axioms are to the mathematician, and facts to the philosopher, the same is a THUS SAITH THE LORD, to the theologian. Now, since whatever God says must be true ; it follows, that no man reasoning fairly from scripture truth can fall into error. Yet theologians contradict each other, and therefore some of them must be wrong. Now there are, in this case, only two sources of error ; the first lies in permitting something which is not divine, which is not true, to mingle with our first principles ; and the second lies in illogical reasoning. Illogical reasoning is easily refuted, but to detect those atomic sophisms which sometimes mingle with original truths—*hic labor, hoc opus est*—this is the task. And this is the task which I must now attempt, under the divine guidance.

## SECTION I.

### *The Doctrine of Representation.*

As it is my wish that the following discussion should not merely exhibit detached objections against a particular theory ; but that it should also present a connected view of the whole subject, I begin with a few observations on the representative character of man ; forewarning the reader, that he is to expect to find those points which are commonly conceded, very concisely stated ; while a more detailed and precise argument is reserved for those topics which belong to the new doctrine.

It is, I believe, conceded by all, that man is a representative animal ; that is, that notwithstanding the free agency which constitutes the individuality of every single man, and renders each individually responsible



for his own proper actions ; such is the constitution of our nature, that one man frequently acts for many others, who are subject to the evil effects of his conduct, or enjoy its good effects, as fully and entirely as if they had acted for themselves. This is what we understand by representation. He who thus acts for others, is called their representative, and they who are subject to the good or evil consequences of his actions, are said to be represented by him. Thus, by the marriage covenant, the husband becomes the representative of his wife in a vast variety of civil transactions ; by the law of nature, parents are the representatives of their children ; and by the constitution of civil society, magistrates are the representatives of their respective tribes and nations. In a word, representation diffuses itself through all the ramifications of social life. Art is man's nature, society man's element, and representation the chief and grand characteristic of human society. Now whether this system of representation should exist, or should not, is not left to the free will and suffrage of mankind. It must exist. The law of our nature, which determines that we should be born helpless babes, and grow up to maturity, through various stages of increase, has imposed on us the invincible necessity of standing in relations wonderfully diversified to each other ; from whence the virtues and vices of others shall influence and affect our well-being equally as if they had been our own virtues and vices. Upon the whole, though each of us possesses his own individuality, and must exist as an individual, in order to support any social relation, yet the social character of man predominates over his individual character.

Now, as all the destinies of man in this life depend on his representative character, it might be expected that

his eternal destinies will be made to turn on the same hinge. Accordingly, the Scriptures teach us, that God constituted the first man the representative of the whole race ; and made the whole of their fortunes, for time and eternity, all their felicity and comfort in this life, and their eternal misery or happiness in the life to come, to rest entirely on their ancestor's obedience or disobedience, upon his virtue or his vice, upon his righteousness or unrighteousness.

I grant, indeed, that it is an awful thought, that I, who am conscious of my own free will and personality, who can think and act for myself, and who have so important interests at stake, should be placed in circumstances where I am liable to be doomed to toil and pain, and death in one world, and everlasting misery in another, for the conduct of a man over whom I had no control, and for a sin which no volition of mine could either effect or prevent. This is the view of the subject which always presents itself to our fallen race ; it is the precise profile of the subject which is placed in our view, in the position which we occupy as fallen sinners. And it is on this view that so many have denied the existence of the covenant of works, and sturdily denied the representative character of Adam ; on the allegation that such a constitution of things were incompatible with the moral justice of God. But this objection, which I have no doubt many have made in the sincerity of their hearts, proves by far too much ; it concludes against the moral justice of ten thousand things which we know God to have done, and which we see him every day doing, and under which we are every day smarting. Is it just, I ask, that a brave nation should bleed at every pore, that millions of most industrious men should be stripped, every year, and

every day, of the fruits of their labour, and doomed to suffer the combined affliction of excessive toil, and excessive hunger because their supreme magistrate chooses to plunge them into ambitious wars? Is it justice that millions of men, ardent lovers of liberty, should be doomed to the most degrading bondage and grinding oppression, for centuries together, because their supreme magistrate chooses to play the tyrant? Is it just that millions of our race should be born to no inheritance but disease and infamy, because their parents choose to be vicious? These things indisputably occur in the government of a righteous God; and how shall they be reconciled with his justice? But you will say, that these evils grow out of the system of human things. True, and God of his own free will at first established, and still supports, that system; and produces and regulates all its movements. The system of human nature is worthy of God, because he has established it; and it is a representative system, in which the good or evil conduct of a representative entails blessings or curses, happiness or misery, on those whom they represent; and of consequence, there is nothing repugnant to the moral perfections of the Supreme Being in a system which shall stake the interests,—the highest interests—of millions, and of myriads of millions of men, on the conduct of a single representative.

## SECTION II.

### *Of Adam's Representative Character.*

The doctrine of Adam's representation is admitted among ourselves; but as this piece may chance to fall



into the hands of some who deny that doctrine, and who, of consequence, must esteem the following argument entirely nugatory, I think it absolutely necessary to give here a short scriptural demonstration of the fact, that Adam did represent the human family in the covenant of works. I quote for this purpose, the following well known passages. Rom. v. 12, 13, 14,—  
 “Wherefore, as by ONE MAN sin entered into the world and DEATH by sin ; and so death passed on ALL men, for that *all have sinned* ; (for until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is NO LAW,) nevertheless death reigned, from Adam unto Moses, even over them *who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression*, who is the figure of him that is to come.” See also ver. 15—19. I forbear any other quotations ; as my intention is, simply to state the doctrine as exhibited in scripture, and not to illustrate it at large. From the passage quoted, and that referred to, we collect the following points of doctrine :

1. That by one man’s (Adam’s) sin—and that a single transgression—sin entered the world.

2. That in consequence of sin, death, which is its wages, also entered into the world.

3. That from the universality of death in this world, we must infer that all men are sinners.

4. That as sin is the transgression of the law, all men who are under Adam’s sin, were under the law which Adam transgressed.

5. But, since it might be alleged, that men die for their own personal transgressions, and not for Adam’s sin ; the apostle states, that “death reigned from Adam to Moses,” not only over those who had forfeited their lives by their own actual transgressions, but “even

over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," namely, infants and idiots, who were incapable of sinning voluntarily. And therefore, since death is the wages of sin, and sin the transgression of the law ; and, that those persons who never transgressed the law by any act of their own die, it follows, that they are under the law because Adam was under it, transgressed it in Adam's sin, and suffer the penalty of death for that transgression.

This is the outline of the scripture doctrine, on the subject of Adam's sin, and its imputation to those whom he represented, exhibited in the simplicity of the scriptural stile.

But two questions have been moved and much agitated on the subject, to which we must pay some attention ; or rather, a great deal of attention, for a great deal will be necessary to qualify us for thoroughly understanding the exact amount of their meaning. The first of these questions respects the formal consideration in which mankind were viewed in the covenant of works. The second regards the bond which connects mankind with Adam, and brings them under the operation of the covenant. Instead of dealing in subtle speculations and strifes of words, I think it the most advantageous course to state, from indisputable scriptural facts, what I know of the subject, in a manner that shall be as intelligible to the plainest Christian at the spinning-wheel or at the loom, as to the first metaphysician of the age.

It is granted on all hands, that in the covenant, Adam represented human nature as it existed in his own person. This is nothing more than to say, that he became personally responsible for his personal conduct. But the passage which has been quoted from the epis-

tle to the Romans, proves, that the whole human family were as much interested in that transaction as Adam himself ; they were personally bound by the divine institution, and rendered personally responsible, so soon as they should have personal existence, and be capable of the personal attributes of merit or guilt ; and the personal experience of happiness or misery. We infer, like the apostle Paul, the doctrine from the fact. And that a covenant, which was to affect human persons, and human persons alone, should regard them in their human personality, appears to me too plain to require much proof. But, to make assurance doubly sure, to concentrate every ray of divine light which we have it in our power to concentrate, on a subject so deeply interesting to every mortal man, I shall show, that Adam did not represent human nature generally—but human nature, existing in human personality. The fact is simple, the proof is short.

Jesus of Nazareth was a man ; his Heavenly Father prepared him a body—sent forth his son, made of a woman. He possessed human nature in all its parts,—a true body, and a reasonable soul. He was of the blood of that Adam, with whom the covenant was made in paradise, a living part of that human nature, which was represented by Adam in the covenant. Now, I ask, was he represented by Adam in that covenant,—or was he not ? If he was, then he appeared in more than the *likeness* of sinful flesh : he was sinful flesh ; he was born under the wrath and curse of God, like other sinners of the race ; he was not a holy thing, born of the virgin ; he could not become the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. But these are conclusions which no one wearing the *name* of Christian ever has drawn. And I would not have



troubled the reader with a detailed state of the argument, but to prepare him for a question which I shall propose, when he takes the other side of the dilemma.

Let it be denied, then, as it must, that Adam represented the Redeemer of the world, Jesus of Nazareth; I ask, then, why was not Jesus represented in that covenant? Here is human nature, entire human nature; why is it exempted from the law of human nature? What attribute of a human being did Adam possess, which Jesus of Nazareth possessed not? The answer is simple,—he did not possess human *personality*; in other words, he was not a human *person*: and it was the want of that human personality, and that want alone, that exempted him from the personal guilt common to mankind. I know my reader is quite impatient to pour in upon me an objection, or to give a different solution. I shall not trifle with his patience a moment longer. I shall state his solution myself.

The solution contemplated is, that Jesus did not descend from Adam by *ordinary* generation; and that, as *ordinary* generation is the bond which unites us to Adam, the *extraordinary* generation of our Lord prevented a federal union with Adam, and acquitted him from any personal responsibility for Adam's conduct. And I acknowledge, that this is the solution of the question given in the confessions, and catechisms, and formularies of all the reformed churches, and in the writings of the ablest divines; and the solution to which Mr. M'C. repeatedly recurs, through all his publications on federal representation. And I feel that it must excite prejudice against me, to declare, that I am not satisfied with it: a pruriency to deal in new words and phrases, is at once a proof of shallow science and false taste. But, several years ago, when engaged in

studying the covenant of works from the inspired page itself, I was compelled to drop this account of the matter, and search for another ; which, I hope, will prove as satisfactory to my reader as it is to myself. I must, however, be indulged, in justice to myself, to say, that I advance no new doctrine ; I admit, that Adam's natural posterity are under the covenant ; and that Jesus Christ was not—but I insist, that *natural* generation is not the circumstance that brought the former under, nor *extraordinary* generation the circumstance that exempted the other from it.

The jet of the question is here—Was Eve represented by Adam in the covenant of works ?

It appears, from the sacred history, that after the Creator had formed Adam in his own image, he took him into the garden of Eden, and surrendered into his possession all its vegetable treasures, save *the tree of the knowledge of good and evil* ; and this he made the object of his supreme law, of that divine constitution, which, viewed simply as a law, flowing from supreme authority, bound the conscience of man, as a voluntary subject of Jehovah's government ; and which, viewed as a law sanctioned both with penalty and reward, possesses the strict nature of a covenant. “Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” After this God brought to Adam the various tribes of domestic animals, teaching him their natures, names, and uses ; and delivering them into his possession. It was not till after all these transactions had taken place, and till Adam was made experimentally to know, that, notwithstanding all the rich resources of his pure and exalted soul, notwithstanding the rich and exuberant abundance of this blessed planet, a life

of solitude would be a life without happiness. It was not till after all this, that the Lord formed for him a rational and moral companion; a companion that he could love, with whom he could hold rational conversation, with whom he could enjoy, in high and holy moral communion, all the bounties and blessings of God. "And God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and he slept, and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof: and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto man—and God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth on the earth."

From the scriptural account of this whole transaction, I presume every candid inquirer after truth will see cause to believe, that when the covenant was made with Adam, he had not so much as an idea of any human being but himself. How should he? But when Eve was formed and brought to Adam, and the blessing of fruitfulness pronounced on them both, I have no doubt (though the matter is not stated in so many words) that he was commanded to instruct her, and their progeny, when they should in due time arise, in the nature of the divine law under which they were placed; and told, that he was to act for them, as well as for himself, in his covenant relation, and that obedience on his part should be life—and disobedience death, not only to himself, but to them all. I think all this obviously true, and shall not inquire, at present, whither it may carry me.

But, one thing is certain, from Eve's reply to



the tempter, that she *did* consider *herself* under the bond of the covenant. "The woman said unto the serpent, *we* may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden ; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said *ye* shall not eat of it." Certainly Eve did consider herself as under the covenant ; and, as she had no instructor but either God or Adam, it is impossible she should have been instructed wrong. It is true, some commentators (*suo more*) have borne hard upon the phrase *neither shall ye touch it*, as an officious addition to the divine law ; but they forget that Eve was, at that time, female innocence in person, and stood as yet far too high for the censure of any of her degenerate sons or daughters : and even though these words should not have been in the original institute, (a point on which, as we know nothing, we need say as little) they should be suffered to pass as the amiable comment, of an innocent female ; who, timid least she should tarnish her honour, is willing to keep farther from danger than is absolutely necessary to avoid it.

We may argue Eve's interest in the covenant of works, from a different set of promises. For, if she had no interest in that, she can have none in the covenant of grace ; if she be not one of them that died in Adam, neither is she of those who shall be made alive by Jesus Christ. If Eve was not under the law, and Jesus Christ was made under the law to redeem them that were under the law, she has neither lot nor portion in his redemption ; and then, as the law of works and the law of grace, are the only laws ever God gave to mankind, it will follow, that Eve never was under any law. The koran of Mahomet alone can inform us for

what worthy purpose such a being was introduced among us.

Perhaps I may be accused of discussing points not in question, too much in detail. But, when page after page is employed, and speech after speech expended, in proving and explaining the covenant of works, by shadowy metaphors and abstractions, and by phrases which melt into mist when the ray of truth touches them; I hope I may be excused for treating the same subject, as an article of Christian faith, and endeavouring to exhibit it in the pure light of revelation. Besides, it is my wish, instead of a partisan skirmish, to lead up truth in solid columns, capable of presenting a firm front to any foe, from any quarter. But not to run my credit too close—I proceed to my argument.

If Eve was represented by Adam in the covenant, I ask, what formed the bond of connection between her and him? Was it *ordinary generation*? That cannot be. Of all that ever descended from Adam, the most extraordinary beyond compare, was this very Eve. Jesus of Nazareth was only *half* as extraordinary. He was conceived by a mother, and brought forth by a mother; one half the law of human generation was observed in his case; in Eve's case, the whole of that law was unknown. She had neither *father* nor *mother*; of consequence, *ordinary generation* was not the bond which connected Eve with Adam as her covenant head. And, therefore, I conclude, that *ordinary generation* does not connect any one with Adam as a covenant head; for that which can be dispensed with in one case, may be dispensed with in another, and in another, till the exceptions will not leave a single instance to exemplify the rule.

If I were not afraid of getting into subtleties, which might puzzle my readers, and perhaps puzzle myself eventually, I should proceed much farther. But I shall content myself with saying, that the inscrutable counsels of the wonderworking God, should strike us with awful solemnity ; and in no part of creation more than in the creation of ourselves. In Adam we behold a man created out of the ground—in Eve, a woman created out of a rib of Adam—in their posterity, thousands created as much by the immediate agency of God, as either of the former : and, though the event occurs more frequently, it is not the less unaccountable ; yet Adam, Eve, and their posterity, all created by God so many human persons, though created in a different manner, have their destinies bound together by one covenant. But enough.

Let us now bring together Eve and Jesus Christ, for the purpose of comparison. In how many points do they agree ; both derived human nature from Adam, both derived human nature from him pure and holy, and without a flaw—both derived it from him in an extraordinary manner ; but in this they differ, one is under the covenant of works, the other is not. Upon what other difference is this founded ? Reader, on this, and only this, Eve possessed human nature in human *personality*,—Jesus had no human *personality* ; his humanity was united to the personality of his divinity. Reader, reflect upon this. Confidence of opinion is more frequently the result of feebleness, than of strength of understanding, and as often the result of pride as of either ; but, if I dare at all trust to the impression of evidence on my own mind, I must pronounce this argument conclusive. Adam did not represent human nature, simply as human nature ; for then he would have



represented Jesus Christ, whom he did not represent. Neither did he represent human persons as descending from him by *ordinary* generation; for then he could not have represented Eve, whom yet he did represent. But he represented human nature as existing in human personality; whether that person were formed out of the ground, as himself was formed, or taken out of his side by one process of creative agency; or created according to the *ordinary* law of nature, by another species of creative agency.

The general conclusion is, that they were human persons, under the formal consideration of their human personality, that Adam represented. So far, I trust, we are on safe ground. The question is not, *how did they obtain* their human personality, but, *do they possess* it?

Having brought the discussion thus far, that it appears fixed and determined that they were human persons, deriving their humanity from Adam, in whatever way God should think proper to determine, whether by ordinary generation or otherwise; that they were human persons under the formal consideration of their personality; it is time to inquire, whether all the individuals of Adam's posterity were distinctly contemplated in the covenant. Upon this question, let us endeavour to ascertain as much of the truth as comes within the horizon of our vision.

1. There is no question that the covenant, from its own nature, left the number of its subjects to be determined by the sovereign wisdom of God. The law was the law of human nature, existing in human personality. Had Adam fulfilled the righteousness of that law, it would, according to the nature of the covenant, have been transmissible or imputable to every human

person, be the number more or less, on the final catastrophe of the human drama. And now that he has sinned, his sin is imputed to every human person, and would, from the nature of the covenant, be imputed to each one, were the number a million times more than they are, or ever will be. Sin is the transgression of the law, and its wages is death; and what the law saith, it saith to every one that is under the law. Adam transgressed the law in one point; and James informs us, that he who transgresses in one point is guilty of the whole: though obedience must be universal, cursed is he who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them. In a word, the righteousness of the law is a unit, and the transgression of the law a unit, and both are imputed without defalcation, in their integrity and wholeness, to every individual to whom they are imputed at all. Should twenty men tell the same lie, though there is but one lie, there are twenty liars in the world: and should twenty assassins plunge their daggers at the same instant into an honest man's bosom, though there is but one murder, there are twenty murderers, who ought to be hanged.

This doctrine is so obvious, that I do not recollect of ever hearing it contradicted or questioned; and was a good deal astonished that Mr. M'C. should have thought it necessary to prove so much in detail, and in so warm and impassioned a manner, that Adam's guilt is not cut up into shreds, and dealt out in parcels among his posterity; and that Christ's righteousness is not parcelled out among the faithful in the same manner. How could they? That which is less than a *whole sin* is nothing at all; and that which is less than *righteousness*, is no righteousness at all.

2. It is not supposable that Adam knew all his pos-

terity by name, or could contemplate them individually by name in the covenant transaction. I have already said, that it does not appear, that, at the making of the covenant, he had any idea of any human being but himself. But, when Eve was created, and the blessing of fruitfulness pronounced upon them, he certainly did expect posterity ; and certainly was informed, that his standing or falling, should be the standing or falling of himself, his wife, and all his posterity, leaving the number of that posterity to be determined by the sovereign counsels of Jehovah. And knowing, (I presume he knew) that God had his own counsels on the subject, and that those counsels included the whole of the human family, their times, and places, and modes of existence, from the first of them to the last, he considered himself bound for the whole, and for each individual of them. After this is granted, (and can it be denied?) it seems to me a needless refinement, to say, that Adam did not represent every individual of the human race, as an individual ; and I cannot see the utility of the refinement. Adam certainly did intend (or else he acted dishonestly in the transaction) to represent all those, whom God determined he should represent. Let us, therefore, attend to the view which God must have had in this transaction.

3. The question now is, Did God, in the making of the covenant, design the precise number, and the particular individuals, who should be represented in that covenant, and affected by it ? This is no very abstruse point. But, as God's law is a light to the feet, and a lamp to the path ; and as this light, shining with direct rays on the understanding, without the reflections or refractions of human science or human arguments, produces the purest illumination, while it cheers the



feelings and awes the conscience, I shall gratify the reader with a few texts of scripture. The diamond will glitter, even in a coarse setting. "Known unto God," says an apostle, "are all his works from the beginning of the world." "He hath made of one blood," says another, "all nations of men for to dwell upon the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." Indeed it is the universal tenor of the sacred Scriptures, and capable of being demonstrated by the soundest philosophical reasoning, that God knew and determined all his works from all eternity. That he determined the number of the human family, the time and place when each individual should be born, their faculties and their features, their characters and their condition, and the whole scenes and train of their fortunes ; all in them, and about them was known to him, and he called them all by name. In the covenant of works, therefore, God fixed the number of mankind, and designated them in his counsels, who should descend from Adam. He subjected them all to the bond of that covenant ; not one more, not one less, not one else, than those precise, specified individuals comprised in the eternal purpose, and present to the divine mind at the making of the covenant with Adam, was brought under that covenant, or ever shall be affected by it. And each person, as soon as he becomes a person, as soon as human personality can be predicated of him, has his individual personal interest in that covenant, according to the condition in which he finds it.

This is substantially the doctrine of the church of God in all ages ; of the reformed churches it is the doctrine. It has been usually considered, that as God

knew and determined all the individuals of the human family, and destined them to be under the bond of the covenant; and as Adam was bound to assent to the constitution prepared and established; therefore, all those individuals were represented in the covenant, in their individual personality of character. But this view does not satisfy Mr. M'C. He insists, that Adam represented (what he calls) his own body, but not the individuals in their distinct personality. This is, I believe, a fair statement of the question; but this is not the *proper ground* on which to decide it. There is here a *cross light*, which mingles and confounds the features of heavenly truth, and prevents us from discriminating the exactness of the painting. We shall meet this subject again, in another position, under the direct ray of the light, which, coming into the world, enlighteneth every man.

Before dropping the subject of the covenant of works, I beg leave to make myself distinctly understood, that I allude entirely to the transaction recorded in the 17th ver. of the 2nd chap. of Gen.—to a covenant, expressed by Jehovah in so many words, and of consequence assented to by Adam. Other covenant of works I know none. The Holy Scriptures are entirely ignorant of any divine system of religion, save the law of works and the law of grace; at the head of the former stood Adam—at the head of the latter stands Jesus Christ. And both these covenants were distinctly expressed in words among the contracting parties.

I am perfectly aware, that men of highly, and not more highly than justly, respected merit in the Christian church, and from whose merit the spirit of meanness alone could wish to detract; have distinguished between the *natural state* of the covenant of works,

and its *positive* state ; have talked of a covenant *inlaid in man's nature* ; of a covenant *concreated* with Adam. But of such a covenant the Scriptures say not one word, from the beginning to the end. That candour, however, that fairness of feeling and conduct, which ought ever to distinguish the investigators of divine truth, require, that we should attempt to ascertain their exact idea ; and though we should be obliged to condemn their language, as inapplicable to the subject, and calculated to mislead ; we may perhaps find, that they were contemplating dimly through the haze of verbage, a substantial truth.

If, by the natural state of the covenant of works—if, by a covenant inlaid in the nature of man—if, by a covenant concreated with Adam, be meant no more, than that there was a natural *adaptation* in Adam to be placed under such a covenant ; and that it would have been unworthy of the Divine Wisdom to have formed such a being, and destined him to be the father of millions, according to the present law of human descent ; and not to have given him such a law and covenant—if this be all that is meant, it is, unquestionably, sound and true. And this I honestly believe to be the meaning of those who hold this language. But still, the language is improper ; an *adaptation to receive* a covenant, is not a covenant. When the Creator causes a valley to form an inclined plain, in its innumerable windings and meanderings among the interlacing mountains and intervening cascades, from the top of the Alps, or Andes, or Allegany, down to their respective oceans ; he has given that valley a natural adaptation to become the bed of a river : but this adaptation to become the bed of a river, is not a river. To produce the river, the rains must descend, and the springs gush from the



mountain's side. To exemplify our assertion on moral subjects ; every woman who is adapted to the marriage state, is not therefore a wife ; nor is every man adapted to the marriage state, therefore a husband. Now, although Adam was naturally adapted to become a covenant head, the covenant itself is something distinct from that adaptation ; it required a positive, open transaction between the Creator and his creature. Such was the covenant recorded in the second chapter of Genesis, and there never was any other covenant of works made with man.

This theory, that establishes a covenant of works anterior to, and distinct from, the verbal covenant made with Adam in paradise, seems to be built upon the same airy foundation, which supports so many ten thousand similar structures of the human imagination—I mean the opinion, that Adam, without any instruction from God, without any revealed law, without any prescribed rule, might, by the unassisted operations of his natural faculties, have become a very intelligent, moral, and religious creature ; and might have trained up a progeny as intelligent, moral, and pious as himself, and entailed upon them all his blessings. Notwithstanding the boundless extent of this principle, it has been very generally assumed, and assumed without any species of evidence, that I can conceive, either of philosophy or of faith. For, if you ask the abettors of this opinion, what philosophical evidence they have for its truth—what single phenomenon they can produce as the basis of an induction so extensive—if you ask them what man, without instruction, ever acquired the use of language ; what man, without the use of language, ever cultivated his understanding ; what man, without speech and mental cultivation, ever rose to mo-

rality and piety, or ever transmitted them to others ; they are silent. They produce not one single instance ; not one single phenomenon, to substantiate so wide and extensive a theory. On the contrary, you can press them with ten thousand opposing phenomena ; that the deaf are also dumb,—that, without instruction and cultivation, the human animal is distinguishable from brutes, only by superior stupidity, indocility—vicious, intractable, and unmanageable.

If you go to the Scriptures, with the exceptions of a few texts, as I apprehend, very much misapplied, they can furnish as little proof of their assumption. Certainly the Mosaic history teaches us as plainly as it is possible, though very briefly, that when God created Adam, he taught him the use of language, and the rudiments of natural history, agriculture, astronomy, and religion. This is the scriptural account of man's origin. Never did the boundless mind of Burke pronounce a profounder adage, than when he said " Art is man's nature."

It was the purpose of the all wise Creator to form the first man in his own image, and to take his newborn child under his paternal tutelage ; to impart to him all useful instruction respecting his conduct in life ; to place him under a regimen of parental authority, exercised by a revealed, specific law ; and to bind all his posterity in the same general system.

But let me put this question with another much discussed, because both depend on one principle. 1. Some have asked, what would have been the consequence, if, after creating him in the integrity of all his powers, God had left Adam without instruction or positive law ?—and they decide in favour of a religion. 2. What would have been the consequence, if, after

the transgression of our first parents, the Son of God had not interposed as mediator? Here two parties are formed; the one affirming, that as all Adam's posterity were included in the covenant, the divine faithfulness required, that they should be brought into existence to suffer its penalty. Others insist, that the penalty must have been inflicted the moment guilt was incurred; and that, therefore, Adam and Eve would have been put to death, unless Jesus Christ had interposed "in the nick of time." This last seems to be Mr. M'C.'s opinion. There are obvious glances at it in his first publication; and he quotes the passage above transcribed in his defence before the synod, with apparent approbation, and even reasons from it. Let us then bring these propositions to the test, and ascertain whether they mean any thing, or nothing; let us try whether the questions *admit of solution*, or whether they lie "*ultra flammantia mœnia mundi*," where no ray of light visible to mortal eye ever fell.

You ask me what would have been the consequences to Adam and his posterity—IF—If what? If God had given him no supernatural instruction, no revealed law of religion?

I answer, I do not know. I have laid before me, God's plan of his world in the bible, you draw your diameter through the periphery of that divine plan, and ask me how God should make a world out of the other half, I answer, I do not know. But this I know, it is no longer a circle, but a semicircle. It is no longer the plan of God's world. You allow God to make half a world according to his own plan: and throwing away the remainder of his plan; you command me to complete the draft.

You ask me what would have been the consequence

to Adam and his posterity after the fall—*If* the Son of God had not interposed ?

Here again I reply, that the Scriptures, teach us, that the redemption by Jesus is an essential part of the divine plan, that the two covenants, the two covenant heads, and their respective subjects, and all the resulting consequences, form but one grand whole, one mighty conception of the infinite mind ; and again you draw your diameter through the periphery of the system ; you present me one half ; and ask me how God could make a whole world out of it ; without employing the other half. Are these questions which admit solution ? Can they *be known* ? Is not all this world-making ? Let us take warning from the fate of our physical cosmogonists, who, after employing centuries by fire and by water making a world, some out of something, and others out of nothing ; some out of indivisible particles of matter, and some out of indivisible mathematical points, have succeeded, at last, in leaving chaos doubly confounded. I am afraid the moral cosmogonists will fare no better. And truly a pity it is, and a tearful jest, to see human speculation so lavished on insolvable questions, while those which are not only solvable, but of incalculable practical importance, are so generally neglected, perhaps sometimes despised. But it must be so. We will, it seems, expend on perpetual motions, time that had better be employed on carts and wheel-barrows ; and weary ourselves in squaring the circle ; while by neglecting a few ragged accounts of a few paltry dollars and cents, we step out of the world, bequeathing jealousies and wrath, lawsuits and strife, and the long interminable feuds of kindred blood, to our heirs, executors, and assigns for ever.



But let us sum up the positive doctrine which has been ascertained in this discussion.

1. That God, by his sovereign wisdom and power, created Adam with a natural adaptation to be the parent and representative of a race, each of whom might be affected by his virtue or vice, and participate in his happiness or misery.

2. That God did, in his infinite wisdom, make a positive, explicit, verbal covenant with Adam, exactly corresponding with the natural powers and adaptation of the creature ; in which he promised life, as the reward of obedience, and threatened death as the punishment of disobedience ; and that this covenant, this law, includes Adam's posterity, or more strictly every human person.

3. That in this covenant Adam did not represent simple human nature, for he did not represent Jesus Christ, who possessed human nature : nor human nature considered as descending from him by *ordinary* generation, for he represented Eve, who did not so descend from him. But that he represented all human persons, considered in their distinct personality, descending from him in any way which God might be pleased to appoint.

4. That though Adam did not know his posterity individually ; yet God knew them all ; their names, periods, habitations, and every thing respecting them, and did intend that this covenant should include every one of them, and no one else—and Adam must have assented to this covenant in its fullest terms.

These then I consider as established truths, and shall hold myself intitled to assume them as truths, in the subsequent part of this investigation.

Let us, on the other hand, sum up the subjects

which we have rejected as false, or incapable of being proved.

1. A covenant of works, distinct from that made verbally with Adam, we have proved to be without scriptural support, and to be an erroneous conception.

2. That we cannot decide what sort of world this would have been, had God not instructed Adam, and given him the revealed law, or covenant—that we dare not assert that to create a world on such a plan would be worthy of God. But we are sure enough that this is not the plan of the world which God has actually created.

3. That we do not know what would have been the consequence in respect to the human family, if Jesus Christ had not immediately interposed—we do not know whether Adam and Eve would have suffered the infliction of death instantly on their transgression, if Christ had not interposed—we do not know whether without such interposition they must have been kept in being, in order that all their posterity might come into being.—In fine, we do not know whether it would have been worthy of God to create such a race as ours, foreseeing their fall and fate ; and not to provide a remedial system.—But this we know, that such is not the world that God has made. And leaving the world-maker to inhabit his own world,

—Quas condidit arces  
Ipse colat.

We shall content ourselves with humbly tracing the laws, enjoying the comforts, and attempting the duties which belong to the world, in which divine sovereignty has been pleased to order our lot.

Now we shall in our further discussions reject all



these notions, and questions which we have thus proved to be either false or insolvable. We shall not pay the least notice to them, nor once name their name, nor look after a single one of the numerous consequences they generate ; unless some of them should happen so to block up our way that we cannot readily pass. If, therefore, any one should think that he will have need of any or all of these principles, in any future part of this discussion, or any other discussion whatever, I give him fair warning to turn back and examine carefully what has been offered on each subject ; let him prove to his own satisfaction, that these subjects are decided in the sacred volume.—Let him prove to his own satisfaction, that they are capable of ever being solved by the human mind.—I say, let him prove these things to his *own* satisfaction ; and then let him state with simplicity the evidence which has satisfied his mind, and I have no doubt it will satisfy mine. But until this is done, I insist on excluding all those questions intirely. This, I trust, is fair and honourable dealing towards truth, and towards the friends of truth. The analysis of religious truth, like the analysis of natural truth, is a work of patience, circumspection, and time. He that detects a mistake does much, he that adds one ascertained truth to the common stock does more. But let us not be hasty in system-making. Let us lay up the few truths we are sure of properly labelled and described

Poma carpent nepotes.

The reader may recollect, that in page 23, I reserved a subject for future discussion ; I now add, that I reserve some others in relation to the covenant of works ; as they will come up under more favourable circum-

stances, after we shall have examined the covenant of grace, and come to compare the two institutions together. This course will save the trouble and disgust of repetition ; besides that notwithstanding the very extensive analogy which runs through the two covenants of works and of grace ; some of the elemental truths are best studied, and easiest illustrated in the one institution, and some in the other. Here, accordingly, I conclude this part of my task, praying that the spirit of wisdom and grace may lead us into all truth according to the Scriptures.

### SECTION III.

#### *Representation by Jesus Christ.*

I proceed now to investigate the subject of Christ's representative character, in the covenant of grace ; and as the production of human authority on this subject would exact more reading and research, than I have either time or inclination at present to bestow ; and as such authority, when come at, is frequently very difficult to be understood, and after all not conclusive, I shall not trouble myself with inquiring what others may have thought or said on the subject ; but shall go directly to the divine word, where truth blazes in its own essential light and native sphere. I shall also abstain for the present from all definitions ; as it will be time enough (indeed the precise time which scientific investigation prescribes) to define things, when we shall have ascertained what they are. I shall select the few following passages of Scripture out of many.

Prov. viii. 22, &c. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his work of old. I was

*anointed a covenant head* from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was, when there were no depths, I was *begotten* ; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I *begotten*. While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there : when he set a compass upon the face of the depth : when he established the clouds above : when he strengthened the fountains of the deep : when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment : when he appointed the foundations of the earth, then was I by him, as one brought up with him : and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him : *rejoicing in the habitable parts of his earth : and my delights were with the sons of men.* Now therefore, *hearken unto me, O ye children ;* for blessed are they that keep my ways. Hear instruction, and be wise, and refuse it not. Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, watching at the posts of my doors. For whoso findeth me, findeth life, and shall find favour of the Lord. But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul. All they that hate me love death."

The above passage overflowing, at once, with the richness of evangelical truth and the richness of eloquence, is one of the most distinguished, among the distinguished proofs, afforded in the Old Testament, that the ancient Israelites were not those babes in theology, which they are sometimes represented to be ; but, while they must be allowed to stand far below the New Testament church in regard to the extent of their religious knowledge and attainments, they were accu-



ately acquainted with the grand elements of the remedial system ; the eternal divinity and sonship of Messiah, his eternal unction to the mediatorial office, his eternal love to the fallen sons of men ; and his execution, in time, of the duties of his sacred trust, in proclaiming salvation to them all, securing life and happiness to all who should receive his instructions, and submit to his authority ; and pronouncing the sentence of death, inevitable and irremediable death, upon those obstinate sinners, who should wrong their own souls by rejecting him. It is pleasant to expatiate thus on Jewish ground, and to find in this land which the Lord has blessed, the same trees, and fruits, and flowers, and the same productions of every kind, which beautify, and which enrich the paradise of the christian church. The eye pleads to be indulged in reposing a little on the enchanting scene ; imagination would wish to give scope to all her powers in quest of boundless enjoyment. But sober truth reminds us that we live here rather for labour than for enjoyment ; and that our spiritual food, as well as our natural, must be earned by the sweat of our brow. Let us proceed then to cultivate the intellectual field, to weed out the briars, and thorns, and thistles, that whatever may be the issue in respect to ourselves, we may leave the intailed estate to our posterity, at least not worse than when it came into our hands.

As the liberty has been taken to make a couple of alterations in the translation, it is proper that the reasons of the change should be laid before the reader, that he may judge for himself whether they are legitimate improvements, and really necessary to convey the sense of the inspired originals. This shall be done with as little of the air of criticism as possible ;

the learned reader needs only to have the subject suggested ; and even those who are unacquainted with Hebrew literature ; will, from the nature of the subject be able to form a sound judgment.

In the 24th verse I have changed the phrase *I was brought forth*, into *I was begotten* : The Hebrew word בְּרָא, used in the passage, designates the relation between a parent, whether father or mother, and a child ; and is sometimes to be translated *to beget*, sometimes to *bear* or *bring forth*. But since, throughout the whole of the sacred Scriptures, the relation between the first and second persons in the adorable trinity is always represented by that of *father and son*, of *son and father*, the appropriate translation of the word in this place is *begotten*, not *brought forth*. This every reader of the Scriptures will assent to.

In the 23d verse, instead of *I was set up* from everlasting ; I use the phrase *I was anointed a covenant head*. The original word signifies to anoint מָשַׁח and is frequently used to denote the appointment of a public officer, because the rite of anointing with oil was common on such occasions. It is the same word which is used Psalms ii. 5. “ Yet I have set (נִסַּחְתִּי I have anointed) my king upon my holy hill of Zion ;” a text which serves the double purpose of establishing the criticism and the doctrine. From this rite of anointing at their inauguration, princes, or supreme officers, are denominated מְשֻׁחִים, or anointed ones. The translation I have given, viz. *I was anointed a covenant head*, is indeed paraphrastic ; but the idea conveyed is indisputably correct. The Son of God was *set up* from everlasting, was *anointed* a supreme officer ; so says the text ; and the whole current of scripture language goes to prove that he was set up,

and anointed the covenant head of the church ; nor is the slightest hint given us from the beginning of the Bible to its end, that ever he was appointed to another office. Let us now sum up the elementary doctrines of this passage.

1. It teaches us that the eternal, and eternally begotten, Son of God, was set up, and anointed the head of his church, “from everlasting,” from the beginning, (from all eternity) or ever the earth was—before the foundation of our world was laid. There was, therefore, a covenant between the eternal Father and his Son from all eternity. Whether this was a *covenant of redemption*, or was not, the reader perhaps has already decided in his own mind.—I reserve my decision as yet.

2. The Son of God being anointed a covenant head from all eternity, was, by his Father (v. 30.) as one brought up with him ; and was daily his delight ; rejoicing always before him ; *rejoicing in the habitable parts of the earth, and his delights were with the sons of men*. Now these delights must have been placed on men viewed in innocence, or subsequent to the fall. They were not placed on men viewed in innocence ; for not to mention that to call Adam and Eve the sons of men would be a very singular phraseology, there was no reason why innocent men should be more an object of the Son of God’s delight than innocent angels, who at that time were more than merely innocent, they were meritorious, and had secured their eternal standing in the divine favour by their approved fidelity. Of consequence, the objects of his delight were men viewed *after the fall* : and as there was nothing in the foul and guilty race to excite the pure delights of the infinitely holy Son of God—As they were cast



out into the open field weltering in their blood, to the loathing of their persons ; it follows that they must have been viewed as objects of redemption.

This is all I shall determine for the present ; that the Son of God having been, from all eternity, anointed a covenant head, a Redeemer of men, delighted in the objects of that redemption. But I do not inquire, at this stage of investigation, whether these objects comprehend all mankind, or only a part of them ; nor under what formal consideration they were viewed. But it is highly probable that the reader will, as usual, have shot ahead of the writer, and concluded, that those who were the objects of the Redeemer's delight *from all eternity*, are the very same who shall be the objects of his ineffable delight *to all eternity*—and that it is not very likely, that the Son of God delighted from all eternity in those, to whom he will say in the day of judgment, *Depart from me ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you.*

The next passage I shall produce, is found 2d Tim. i. 8, &c. “ Be not thou, therefore, ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner ; but be thou a partaker of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power of God ; who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose ; and THE GRACE which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearance of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.”

I have made a small alteration in the translation, because our present version is neither a correct translation, nor correct English ; the sense, however, is not

affected, and of the propriety of the change of phraseology, the learned will judge.

The apostle speaks of Timothy and himself as converted persons, real living saints; and asserts, that grace was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began, and that they had been converted according to God's eternal purpose, and according to that grace which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began. Now, what was true in respect to Paul and Timothy, purely as saints, or converted persons, is true respecting all saints; and will be true respecting all saints in the judgment day, namely, that they were called with a holy calling, and made living Christians, according to the purpose of God, and the grace which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began.

But how was grace given them in Christ Jesus before the world began? Look back to the foregoing article, and compare the Old Testament scriptures with those of the New. Jesus Christ was anointed a covenant head from everlasting; and in that very anointing, grace was given in him to all who ever shall believe in his name, and they shall be called with a holy calling, according to the *purpose* of him who gave them grace in his own Son before the world began.

I might go on to reason on these data, and, placing before my imagination the doleful throng on the left hand of the Redeemer, in the judgment day, and the glorious throng on his right; I might say grace was given to all these in the Son of God before the world began; and they were all called with a holy calling, according to the purpose of him who gave the grace—but was grace given in Christ Jesus before the world began, to those to whom neither he nor his Father

have given grace in time? Did God purpose to call with a holy calling, those whom he has not called, and never will call? I can well believe that the delights of the Son of God were with you, ye glorious saints of his, before the foundation of the world; but, can I believe that his delights were then with those abandoned rebels, whom he abhors and dooms to everlasting burnings? But, although it is impossible not to spare a passing glance to these trains of argumentation, it is not our intention to forsake our present purpose, which is merely to establish elements for a system: and the reader is forewarned to keep the rein on his impatience, as a great deal remains still to be done, before we shall be prepared for systematizing. The hewers are in the mountains, and the quarrymen are in the quarries; every beam must be squared, every joint and tenon must be fitted; every stone must be chiselled to its exact form and dimensions; and, should we succeed in all this, according to the draft and plan which the Divine Architect has furnished us, you shall soon see stone come to its stone, and beam to its beam, till the temple of the Lord shall tower towards the heavens, without the sound of a hammer.

The next passage I produce, is found Isa. liii. 10th, &c.—“When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied: and by the knowledge of himself shall my righteous servant justify many: for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he shall pour out his soul unto death: and he



was numbered with the transgressors ; and he bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.”

The only critical remark which it is necessary to make on this passage is, that I have changed *his knowledge* into *the knowledge of himself*, and for this reason ; the phrase *his knowledge*, according to the usual English idiom, means the knowledge of which he is the *subject*, or the knowledge which he possesses. Now, the knowledge which Jesus Christ possesses cannot justify any person ; or, if it did justify any, it must justify all. But the knowledge of which Jesus is the object, or the knowledge which men have of him as the mediator between God and man, is the justification of all who are justified, according to the Scriptures. “ This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” But to cut off all possibility of mistake, I would remark, that the knowledge of Christ in question is not a naked, metaphysical, speculative knowledge—for even a devil could say, “ I know thee who thou art, the holy one of God ;” \* but it is that knowledge which the Holy Ghost giveth when he taketh of the things that are Christ’s and sheweth them unto us—it is a knowledge which issues in faith, love, and obedience.

The points which I wish to establish by the above passage, are the following :

1. That the Son of God engaged to make his soul an offering for sin, and to bear the sins of many ; and that this engagement took place when he was *anointed a covenant head* ; that is, “ from everlasting,” or “ ever the earth was.”

\* Mark i. 24.



2. That his Heavenly Father engaged, that, in consequence of his making his soul an offering for the sins of many, he should have them as his reward,—he should justify many. he should travail in sore travail, but not without effect,—he should see his offspring: and the pleasure of the Lord, the salvation of sinners, should prosper in his hand.

3. From the two foregoing principles I deduce a third, that, so sure as the faithful Son of God should fulfil his part of the covenant, by bearing the sins of many, and making his soul an offering for sin,—so surely would his Heavenly Father give him the travail of his soul; and that, of consequence, *some men must be saved by the mediation of Jesus*, in order to vindicate the faithfulness of God the Father. But who? How many? Was the number definite or indefinite?

Two or three passages more from the sacred page, and I am done on this subject. John xvii. 1, &c.—“These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, Father, the hour is come, glorify thy son that thy son also may glorify thee: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to *as many as thou hast given him*.” John vi. 37. “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.”

As I established from the 53d of Isaiah, that a seed was pledged to Messiah as the travail of his soul, and of consequence, that *some* men must be saved, in order to preserve inviolate the fidelity of the eternal Father; so I infer from these passages, that the number was fixed and definite; that Jesus Christ received power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to *as many* as the Father hath given him; that all who

were the Father's by electing love, were Christ's by the covenant bond, and that they shall come to him ; and that he that cometh, shall in no wise be cast out.

We are now ready for the summation of this series, I hope the reader has been sufficiently attentive to render an enumeration of the principles which have been established superfluous, I trust that matter to himself.

But now I must ask, had Christ Jesus, the Eternal Son of God, the same relation in the eternal covenant to those who shall be saved, and to those who shall not? Let this question be well considered ; and, that it may be well considered, let us turn it around, and survey it in every position. Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God, *was anointed a covenant head* from all eternity ; was it to head to everlasting glory those whom he will head in the judgment day, or those whom he shall not head? Was he a covenant head for those whom the Father gave him, or for those whom he did not give him? Did he travail, as in birth, for the children whom God gave him, or for those whom God gave him not? But enough, surely. That the Eternal Father, and his Eternal Son, in that covenant, which was from everlasting, knew every individual who ever should be saved by Jesus Christ, and had a respect to, each one of them by name, is an indubitable fact : it is the high prerogative of infinite wisdom to be incapable of ignorance ; it is the glorious prerogative of God never to do any thing in the end, which he did not propose to do from the beginning.

In the above questions I have used the phraseology, Had Christ Jesus, the Eternal Son of God, any *relation* to those whom the Father gave him in the everlasting covenant—different from his relation to those

who were not given him. I did not use the word *representation* ; that spectre shall be put down on another field. But if the Son of God, when he was from everlasting anointed a covenant head, bore a relation to those whom the Father gave him—which relation he did not bear to those who were not given him—where is the use of disputing about words? It is that relation, whatever it is, that is intended to be expressed by those who assert, that, in the eternal covenant, the Son of God was the representative of the elect, of those whom the Father gave him.

I am not one of those, God forbid I ever should, who ascribe every defect in a publication, to a cunning artifice of the author to conceal the truth. But I confess, I have been astonished not to find in any of Mr. M'C.'s publications, a single glance at the eternal covenant between the Father and the Son. And yet, this is precisely the subject in dispute. It has been customary with all divines, who admit a covenant of grace at all, to make, in one way or other, a distinction between the transaction of the Father and Son in Heaven from all eternity, and the effects of that transaction in time. Some have called the former the covenant of redemption, and the latter the covenant of grace ; making them two covenants. Some again, who insist that there is but one covenant, make a distinction between that covenant and its execution. Now Mr. M'C. confines himself entirely to what the latter call the execution of the covenant. In this view his first publication (*The Body of Christ*,) has its merit ; I mean the merit of being perfectly sound. It is an absolute truth, as he states, that the Holy Spirit is the bond of union between Jesus Christ and believers ; and that this same work of that spirit, produces on their



part faith, love, and submission, and gives them an interest in the righteousness and grace of the Redeemer, so that they are one with him ; and that they all stand or fall together—"because I live ye shall live also." His treatise relates entirely to what we have been in the habit of calling, the execution of the covenant of grace ; and his views are correct, but he has not added a single idea to the stock in circulation time out of mind.

But why did he not professedly examine whether the Scriptures reveal an eternal covenant between the Father and Son ? Why does the whole amount of his reasoning go to the denial of such a transaction ? I understand that there are several who are about adopting his theory ; all of whom avoid this ground ; one of them at least who was tolerably ardent in the cause ; when pressed with scriptural authority for an eternal covenant, and asked whether there was any covenant before the creation of man ; declined giving any answer. From which it was natural to conclude, that this part of the subject has not been studied by them. The only honourable conjecture I can form respecting the cause of so strange an omission, is, that whenever some favourite idea, sparkling with the brilliancy of novelty, takes possession of the human mind, all the stars in the intellectual horizon are absorbed in its splendour ; wherever we turn, wherever we look, we see it, and it alone : It enlightens all subjects, it resolves all difficulties, it removes all objections ; and we are perfectly astonished how purblind mortals contrived to grope their way on this dark planet before the rising of our star. To this species of fascination all who *think*, are subject, and subject according to the ardour of their temperament, and the only cure is to lock up the pen, and clap a wafer on the lips ;



and leave to time, the great subduer of all our passions, to moderate a romantic ardour.

I have proved from the Holy Scriptures that the Son of God was *set up*—was anointed, *a covenant head* from all eternity—That a seed was given him to be the fruit of his soul's travail—That power was given him over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as the Father had given him—That all those that the Father hath given him shall come unto him—That he rejoiced from all eternity in the habitable parts of the earth, and that his delights were with the sons of men.

I do therefore assert, that the covenant of grace was made between the Father and the Son from all eternity : That the Son of God did stand in a relation to the elect, which relation did not exist between him and the rest of mankind ; And it is this relation which we mean, when we say that Christ Jesus represented the elect in the covenant of grace. If the special relation be admitted, it is idle to dispute about the sound by which we shall express it. Thus far we are sure we are right, and cannot possibly be wrong. Mr. M'Chord will doubtless be looking forward for difficulties ; and will already be asking, If this special relation be admitted, how can you reconcile to candour, moral truth, and justice, God's commanding those who do not stand in this peculiar relation to his Son, to accept his righteousness, and submit to his authority ? I reply that this difficulty shall be decided on its own proper ground. It is not forgotten nor shall it be forgotten. In the mean time, we are sure that in the eternal covenant, the Son of God was anointed a covenant head with a special relation to his elect ; which relation did not exist between him and the non-elect. We are sure this is God's truth ; and we shall not dread any

difficulties to which it may expose us. The same divine truth which carries us into difficulties, will carry us out of them.

We are now on the ground to decide a question which we have in reserve. By turning back to page 23, the reader will find it. This question is now decided, but I shall sum the evidence. Mr. M'C.'s idea is, that a covenant can include only beings actually existing, that Adam represented himself in the covenant of works, and that his posterity are represented only when they actually exist, and they are represented only as a part of the original Adam. He carries the same idea into the covenant of grace ; that no believer is represented by Jesus Christ till he actually exists as a believer. If this be true there could be no such thing as an eternal covenant, because there was nothing to represent. Most assuredly the Son of God did not represent himself in the covenant of grace—most undoubtedly he did not come into this world to seek and to save the Son of God : most undoubtedly he did not shed his blood to ransom the Son of God, either personally or substantially considered. As it was impossible that he should represent himself, so according to Mr. M'Chord's ideas it was impossible that he should represent human persons, or even human nature, for human nature did not exist. There could be no representation, unless any one can brook the blasphemous nonsense, that the glorious Son of God condescended to become the representative of *nothing*. On this system there was no eternal covenant. But I have the word of the Eternal Son of God, that he was anointed a covenant head from all eternity—And that before the earth existed his delights were with the sons of men. My bayonet now more

than crosses that which opposes me. It drinks the heart's blood of the new system : but it is not mine—He gave it me, and his be all the glory. But I cannot but conjure those who are for setting aside the eternal covenant of grace, only to consider with whom it is they are at issue—THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE. Lay thy hand on thy mouth. Say no more.

The reader will have the goodness to apply the principle of this reasoning to the covenant of works ; and to satisfy himself that human beings may be included in a covenant long before they are born—That God had determined the number, and the names, and the bounds of the habitation, of all who should be affected by Adam's covenant, in his own infinite mind, when he bound them all in the covenant of works. He knew them all, and intended that they jointly and individually should be affected by that covenant. To this covenant Adam consented, and it did not require more humility than he possessed to assent to the will of God ; notwithstanding that, he could not foresee the extent of the consequences—Though a similar assent to the will of God without an explanation might perhaps require more humility than we can furnish in this philosophical age. But alas, we lost our humility at the same time that we lost our wisdom, and all our other merits.

But gentle reader, thou art probably tired, and so am I : wishing thee therefore a good night, and sound repose, I withdraw. In the morning we shall be called to tempt our perilous way.

*Per rupes, scopulosque, adituque carentia saxa,  
Qua via difficilis, quaque est via nulla .*



The last phrase is too strong : there *is* a way ; and the *pillar of a cloud* by day, and the *pillar of fire* by night shall be our guide ; when it stands we encamp, and when it moves we march ; and though we should lay our bones in the naked sands, we shall not attempt to cross the awful wilderness by any other guide.

## SECTION IV.

### *Of Christ's Righteousness.*

The subject proposed for discussion, is not properly any part of the question at issue respecting the new doctrine. Mr. M.C. has the same views respecting the righteousness—the atonement—the obedience and sufferings of Christ, with the purest churches of the reformation. This public notice is given, least the reader finding me in opposition to that gentleman in some things, should imagine me opposed to him in every thing ; and should infer that because I attempt to establish a doctrine, therefore he denies it. It is indeed, one of the grand secrets of controversy, to prove what your adversary admits, and it is still better to prove what nobody ever denied—To heap argument on argument, and demonstration on demonstration—To challenge your opponent and the whole human race to contradict you—And then you may fling out a dozen or two hard terms about intellectual force, and intellectual debility, about prejudice, and fools, and ideots ; nine-tenths of your readers will all this time imagine that your opponent is the driveller at whose solid head the thunderbolts are launched ; and that you are the intellectual giant, whose single arm is law. When-



ever a good treatise shall be published on the art of sophistry, this precept will occupy a distinguished place in it.

—Nec Phœbo gratior ulla est,  
Quam sibi quæ Vari præscripsit fragina nomen.

Such a work is a desideratum in modern literature ; and if well executed, would bid more fair for public usefulness than any of the voluminous and endless publications of our age. O that some logical Machiavel might arise, to shew mankind not how they *ought* to reason, for that would do them little good—but to shew them how they *do* reason. The LOGICIAN might then be bound in the same vellum, and placed on the same shelf with the PRINCE.

The sole object of discussing the subject of Christ's righteousness in this place, is a desire that the present treatise may contain something like a synopsis of the scriptural doctrine respecting the fall and recovery of man. The points which are generally acquiesced in shall be briefly noticed, and the principal attention directed towards the points where truth is either assaulted or menaced.

That sinners of mankind are saved by Jesus Christ, and by him alone, is the sum total of the doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures ; a doctrine which no man can deny without giving up those Scriptures as false, and delusive ; and becoming a real infidel, by whatever name he may choose to be called. And if any one desires to know what this Saviour has done, is doing, and will do, for the salvation of sinners, let him search the Scriptures, and he shall be satisfied. The few following passages of Scripture, it is hoped will give a sufficiently satisfactory idea of the subject.

John x. 14, &c. "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice: and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd."

"Therefore doth my father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No person taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father."

It is apparent that our Lord speaks of his sheep under *different* considerations: some of them already knew him, were already obedient to his voice; I know my sheep, and am known of mine—Some of them were yet strangers; But them also, says he, must I bring, and *they shall hear* my voice: but for both he laid down his life.

Titus ii. 14. "Who *gave himself* for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works."

Heb. ii. 10. "It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect *through sufferings*."

Gal. iv. 4, 5. "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman; made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

Mat. v. 17. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to FULFIL."

"Mat. iii. 13, &c. "Then cometh Jesus from Gal-

lilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me. But Jesus answering, said unto him, suffer it to be so now : for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."

These texts are sufficient, though it would require only the trouble of transcription, to produce ten times as many ; but these are sufficient to prove to any inquirer, that the Son of God was born under the law of the broken covenant of works. That he was subject to that law, and fulfilled it ; that he paid the penalty incurred by Adam's transgression ; and wrought out the righteousness which the law required—that he left nothing undone, either in regard to suffering, or in regard to obedience, which the law did, or could demand—and that he was thus subject to the law—that he thus fulfilled all its requisitions, not of necessity, but of his own free choice. It is this fulfilling of the law in all things, that is meant by Christ's righteousness. And it is no absurd, it is no unphilosophical assertion, to say that men are saved by the righteousness of Jesus Christ ; for it is no more than to say that they are saved by the original law, which God gave them, in Paradise. In fact, men are ultimately saved by the covenant of works ; but truly not by works of righteousness which *they themselves* have done.

While the generalization of our ideas, while systematizing, marks the dignity of the human understanding, premature generalization, systems formed out of defective materials, have done immense injury. Some theorists, for reasons which it would not be difficult to assign, have admitted that the sufferings of Jesus, but not his obedience, are the grounds of a believer's justi-



fication. They had a *system*, and to preserve the integrity of their system, they must reject as plain a truth as the Scriptures contain ; and adopt a notion as inconceivable, and as absurd as any that ever entered the mind of man. For, if the Son of God had not been under the precept of the law, he never could have been under the penalty ; the latter is entirely subsidiary to the former ; till he was under the precept of the law, he could no more owe it satisfaction for past violation, than obedience, and if he was under it all, he must owe it both. And so it commonly fares with system-mongers. Happier is the man, and safer by far, who governs himself by a few ascertained truths, though they should be as detached, and unsystematized, as the proverbs of Solomon, or the proverbs of Sancho Panza, than the man who rashly makes a system without materials.

Now it is salvation by this righteousness of Jesus Christ, this perfect fulfilment of the law which God originally gave to man, which is proclaimed in the the gospel. Rom. i. 16, &c. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth ; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the *righteousness of God*, revealed from faith to faith, as it is written the just shall live by faith." I had marked for quotation a great many passages of Scripture on this subject, in order to shew that the covenant of grace is *essentially* the covenant of works—that it is the most philosophical thing in the world, a philosophy of which no man need be ashamed, to assert, that in the gospel a righteousness of God's own—which righteousness is neither less nor more than a complete fulfilment of the original law—is revealed to man—and



that every subject of that law, who possesses this righteousness shall be, and must be justified by it. But the work swells under my hand, and I am pinched for time. I therefore proceed directly to the fatal spot where the battle must be decided one way or other.

## SECTION V.

The question then is this. Does the *merit and imputability* of Christ's righteousness depend on his representative character?

Reader, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground! A sacred horror chills my blood through all my veins—*Horresco referens*. On this sacred central spot, chiefs of mighty armies and high renown have fallen: here the fiend has ten thousand times triumphed. From this spot branch off in all directions these human systems of theology, which have injured the beauty of the gospel; and been the cause of so much schism, strife, and controversy, and malignant passion in the church of God. Systems around which theologians *ὡς λυκοί*, engage, nor quit the grinning hold, *vitamque in vulnere ponunt*. Let us therefore pause on this spot, and invoking the spirit of all truth to guide our every step, let us advance with sacred awe and sacred caution.

And since it cannot be denied that Adam's guilt is ours, *because he represented us*—that God visits the iniquities of the father's on their children, because those fathers *represented* them—that nations are punished for the sins of their rulers, because those rulers *were their representatives*; let us suppose that the imputa-

bility of Christ's righteousness depends on his *representative* character—that is, his righteousness is meritorious of human salvation, and capable of being imputed to men, because he represented them in the covenant of grace. Adopting this idea, let us try whither, in conjunction with undoubted truths, it will carry us : and let us mark every step of our progress.

#### I. ROAD.

1. Eternal salvation, or in other words, the righteousness of Jesus Christ, the procuring cause of that salvation, is offered to all mankind by God himself in the gospel.

2. Therefore the righteousness of Jesus Christ is meritorious of the salvation of all mankind, and is capable of being imputed to every one of them.

3. *But the righteousness of Jesus is meritorious and imputable to men, because he is their representative.*

4. Therefore Jesus Christ represented all mankind, and every man of them, in the covenant of grace.

5. Consequently all mankind and every man, will eventually be saved. Though worlds should perish, though ages of torment should hold on their incalculable round, though system should succeed to system, till the human imagination becomes incapable of grasping the vast idea—still the son of God will conduct to glory all that he *represented*.

Here then we have the system of the *redemptional universalists*. The *deistical* universalists are a different breed, and closely allied to the family of atheists.

The reader is requested to put the above train of argument to the severest test. Let it be tortured, to confess if it has a single secret error about it ; with the

exception of the third step, which I have put in *italic*, merely to mark it as *suspicious*, for even the guilty shall not be condemned till the jury are satisfied with evidence, and agreed to a man in their verdict. But admitting this step to be legitimate, I pronounce the whole system invulnerable.

## II. ROAD.

1. Eternal life is offered to all men by God, and they are commanded by God to accept it.

2. It is therefore equally capable of becoming the property of all.

3. *But the reason Jesus can impart life to all, is because he gave his life for all, or represented all men, in the covenant of grace.*

4. Therefore Jesus Christ made a universal atonement for all mankind.

5. But as it is impossible to imagine that he should atone for the sins of all men, and withhold from some of them the grace requisite to make the atonement profitable ; universal grace is given to all men to be saved by the atonement.

6. And as some men are saved and others not, it follows, that those who are saved, are not saved by the atonement of Jesus Christ, nor by the grace originally given them ; for these were equally the possession of those who are not saved ; consequently they who are saved must be saved by *their own personal faith and righteousness*, which are the only circumstances in which they differ from the others.

7. Therefore Jesus Christ did not save men ; but placed them in a saveable state ; and by his universal

redemption and universal grace, put them in a condition to save themselves.

8. Since the atonement and grace are universal, and some believe and others do not believe, it follows that the grace is not necessarily efficacious ; and since no other cause can be assigned of its efficacy in any, we must ascribe it to the free-will of man.

9. And since the grace of the Lord Jesus is not necessarily efficacious, on this free-will, it follows that a saint's standing in grace is not infallibly secured, he may therefore fall away and be lost.

This is the Arminian system ; and let the reader be conjured to put it to the torture, and try its metal. With the exception of the third step, now become doubly suspicious, I do believe that it will stand the most rigorous investigation that can be given. I can only speak for myself, and must say this system appears to me, with the single exception mentioned, to be one of the most gigantic efforts of human genius. Neither St. Paul's at London, nor St. Peter's at Rome, nor any other basilic, ancient or modern, exhibits such grandeur of design, such proportion of parts, such powerful combinations, such totality, as this system. I do not believe the system to be true ; and therefore I wonder at it the more ; what painful researches ; what troublesome objections ; what searching of the Scriptures ; what textual difficulties ; what verbal niceties ; and yet after all the structure is finished off, and covered in with so bold and awful a dome, that we gaze with wonder and with terror, and ask if the architect was a man ! But wonder at what we may, it is no wonder at all that the heads which put this system together should hitherto have double distanced all competitors on the field of moral science. I speak of it



merely as a system; it is possible to better it all around with texts of Scripture; but if its elemental principles be granted, it will be impossible to find a flaw in the arguments.

Let us advert to one curious circumstance, which shows the struggle of sound faith with false philosophy. The Arminian has often been puzzled with the question, why, seeing you maintain *universal atonement* and *universal grace*, do you not also admit universal salvation? And he certainly would have, according to fair reasoning, to have admitted universal salvation, had not his faith hedged him in. He saw in the Scriptures that all men will not be saved; and admitting this among his elemental truths; he had to part with the redemptional universalist. His task became more difficult; but his system became grander, and more complex.

### III. ROAD.

1. The offer of everlasting life is made to all men in the gospel.

2. Jesus Christ specifically atoned for the elect; or *represented* the elect alone in the covenant of grace.

3. *But this atonement, or its imputability, depended on his representative character.*

4. Now since he specifically died for the elect, and is proclaimed a Saviour to the non-elect, it follows that he must in *some sense* have died for all men.

What that *some sense* is we are not told; but it would seem that he did not die for the non-elect in the *same sense* in which he died for the elect.

This doctrine I have read in a book written by a

New England divine, who had the honour of representing his country in the congress of the United States. The same doctrine may be found in the writings and speeches of others ; but I cannot name any party or denomination who have made it their badge and shibboleth.

#### IV. ROAD.

1. The gospel offers righteousness and life to all men, by Jesus Christ.

2. Therefore men indefinitely have a right to accept this atonement.

3. But the imputability of that atonement depends on his representation.

4. Consequently Jesus Christ died not for all men—nor for any man in particular, but for men indefinitely. With respect to this system of *indefinite* atonement, I mean to say only this much, that it has this singular merit, honour, and glory, beyond all the other systems that ever were in this world, that it is built up without the expense of one single idea, good or bad.

Is it any wonder that the human understanding, after finding itself tantalized with a vocabulary of sounds, about an atonement made for those who were not intended to be saved by it—and made in *some sense* for all men—about an *indefinite* atonement, made for every man, and for no man—Should turn away with disgust from sounds which neither profit the head nor the heart, nor fit a man for either this life or the next ; and give up the atonement altogether. There is no mystery respecting the cause of the increase of Socinianism, it is only ceasing to use a word, that has long lost its meaning.

## V. ROAD.

The most frightful idea on the subject of atonement, or any other subject, that ever entered the human heart, was broached some years ago in Edinburgh. It was this : That Jesus Christ did indeed die for all—both elect and non-elect. That he purchased them all from his heavenly Father ; the elect, that he might confer upon them eternal life, the non-elect, that he might inflict on them everlasting wrath. That, in consequence of this purchase, he has the privilege of bestowing on the one, the everlasting consolations of heaven ; and of inflicting on the other, the superior torments of what they called *gospel wrath* ; in short, that the Son of God laid down his life, as much that he might damn one class of mankind, as that he might save the other. But I have never understood, that a party could be gotten to rally round so black a standard. The heart recoiled from giving both God and the Saviour such a character, that it could not behold them without terror and hatred.

I could name some other systems, corrupted by the same sophism ; but as the worst of all surfeits, is a logical surfeit, I forbear. There are, however, some straggling, unsystematized ideas floating in society, which I may just hint at ; such as the following :—That we *offer* eternal life to all the hearers of the gospel, because we do not know who are elected. This is a very lank sophism ; because since it is God, who knoweth all things, that makes the offer of life to all men, it follows, that either it ought to be complied with, or ought not : and if complied with, the salvation of the applicant must be possible, nay certain. Again,

we have heard it said, that there is not a promise in the whole word of God, except to believers : which is as much as to say, that a man must believe, before there is any thing for him to believe ; or, speaking in the technical phrase, the act of faith must exist before its object ; or, talking with mathematicians, I must demonstrate a proposition before there can be any proposition to be demonstrated. But I forbear.

Let us now sum up our acquisitions. We have found, that by assuming the principle that Christ's righteousness is imputable to men, *because he represented them in the covenant*—and, combining it with truths of unquestionable authority, it universally led us astray ; it made us, in one set of principles, universalists, in another, Arminians, in another, something else ; in a word, there was not an error on the subject, into which it did not lead us ; till we were obliged to give up atonement all together : Can this principle then be true ? Can that condiment which mixed with every dish of every kind, converts them all into poison, be any thing but poison ? Did ever truth in conjunction with truth generate error ?

Now this very principle is assumed through the whole of Mr. M'C.'s scheme. Nay, it was the *assumption* of this principle that laid the necessity for his scheme. It mingles itself with the whole, and leavens the whole ; it is the *anima mundi* of the system, *from it* all things proceed, and *into it* all things are finally resolved. I shall verify this by a quotation.

PLEA, p. 28, 29. After proving, by several quotations, that the gospel offers peace, and pardon, and everlasting life, to every creature, he goes on to argue thus :

“ Clearly then, if the commission embraces ‘every



creature,' and is to be executed in this way, the proffer of the gospel must include all the virtues of the atonement, intercession, and every other official act of our Lord Jesus Christ, which enter into the ground work of salvation. Now let it be inquired how such a proclamation of the gospel of peace can possibly comport with the assumptions laid down in the individualizing scheme? Did our Lord Jesus Christ formally and from the first, include under *his representation* all those whom it is his pleasure shall be saved? Did he do it in such a way that the virtues of his office, while they must of necessity extend to them formally and legally speaking, cannot by possibility be extended to others, but upon the supposition, that as they *were not represented, they must be pardoned without satisfaction, justified without righteousness, and saved without intercession?*—THEN, we say, that the proclamation of the gospel to characters of this description, would not merely amount to a piece of solemn mockery; it would be directly and unequivocally the proclamation of a lie; and the doctrine which authorizes it, is nothing less than blasphemy against Almighty God. What! men officially appointed to offer pardon and righteousness, and eternal life, in God's name, 'in Christ's stead,' when no pardon has been produced, that the law will permit to be applied to them! When no righteousness has been prepared, that by possibility of application might be made to cover them! When no intercessor could, consistently with his official engagement, undertake for them! And when they are left, to all intents and purposes, in the same relations, and in the same condition in law and in fact, as if no such thing as a Saviour had been appointed for the world! Who dare ascribe to God this worse than Punic faith?

Who that does ascribe it, dare presume to say that ‘faithfulness shall be the girdle of his reins?’ ”

Clearly then Mr. M‘Chord does assume, as a principle, that the *imputability* of Christ’s righteousness depends on his *representative* character—and that if mankind were not represented by Jesus Christ, this righteousness would not be capable of being imputed to them. And truly, if I believed the assumption, I could not get free from the conclusion. And then I must either give up the bible as a poor delusion ; or hold it, without being able to see its consistency with any one moral attribute of the Deity. Mr. M‘C. does not draw his conclusions too strong, he does not speak too loud ; human language has not thunders loud enough to anathematise the idea, that Christ’s righteousness is not imputable to every soul of man ; that every soul of man, who hears the joyful sound, has not a right, nay, is not bound in duty, bound under everlasting penalties, to accept the proffered life—And that every soul who doth embrace the proffered life, shall enjoy it, so surely as it is true, that God, who cannot lie, hath said it. I therefore go on to demonstrate.

## SECTION VI.

*That the imputability of Christ’s righteousness does not depend in any manner, nor in any degree, on his representative character.*

But what ! my reader will say, did you not tell me, at the beginning, that the imputability of Adam’s guilt depended on his representative character ? I did. And

did you not admit that the imputation of merit and demerit, in human societies, depended on the representation of those societies by their rulers? I did. And do you assert that the imputability of Christ's merit does *not* depend on his representative character? I do. I assert, that it does not at all depend on such representation. Will you not then involve yourself in a difficulty by assigning representation as the ground of imputation in the one case, and not in the other? But what if I should get into a difficulty, since I cannot avoid it? At least you had better remove the difficulty before you go farther. No, Sir, I am not fond of difficulties, and keep out of them as long as I can. And I shall tell you how I mean to manage this one. I shall try to demonstrate my doctrine; If I fail in my proof I shall never meet the difficulty—should I succeed in proving that this is the very truth, then I shall hold it in spite of ten thousand difficulties. And whenever I meet a difficulty which I cannot remove, or jump over, I shall plant my standard, and let the commander in chief call a better soldier to carry it farther.

I do not here urge the proof which has been offered, that the assumption of the truth of the principle in question, has always corrupted the faith of the gospel; and I should have spared myself the trouble of stating the subject with so much formality: but I thought it a fair occasion to pay an old debt, long due to old foes. We never have met without a battle; and we never shall meet without a battle. They have had their day, and I shall have mine; for the feud is sworn and deadly on both sides. I have showed to all, the very spot on which those who have hitherto corrupted the church's faith, have stumbled. It was by assuming that the im-

putation of Christ's righteousness depends on his *representative character*. And it is an anxious desire to discharge a duty of love to Mr. M'C. by setting him, as soon as possible, on his feet, and keeping him from the most unfortunate of all situations, that of a leader in erroneous doctrine—that induced me to hasten so rapidly, this publication. I do not believe that his error has yet essentially affected his faith, and perhaps *he* might continue to hold his otherwise salutary creed. But when I consider that this single mistake has, in all instances, issued in fearful consequence, I must not be slack.

By the righteousness of Jesus Christ, I understand his complete fulfilment of the law of works, both by obeying its precept, and paying the penalty incurred by human transgression. But if you ask *why* it is meritorious? I ask again, what makes light to be light? what makes truth to be truth? Because it is their *nature*, you will reply—right! And let me add, that it is the glorious nature of righteousness to be meritorious, according to the nature of the law. Now the law of works was of such a nature, that its righteousness, whenever wrought out, was capable of being imputed to all the subjects of that law. If Adam had fulfilled the law, this righteousness would have been imputable to all mankind. This law Jesus Christ actually fulfilled, and produced its perfect righteousness. But the righteousness which the law required, was a righteousness capable of being imputed to every human being; consequently the righteousness of Jesus Christ is capable of being imputed to every man. If he had not produced a righteousness capable of saving every man under the law, he would not have produced the righteousness of the law. Of consequence, the imputability



Christ's righteousness, springs entirely from the nature of the covenant of works. I call this demonstration unassailable !

The provisions of the covenant of grace have nothing to do with this subject. To whom God will eventually bestow this righteousness—how many he will give to his Son, as the travail of his soul, are questions for *them* to settle among themselves. They may do what they will with their own. Let no man presume to question them ! But the righteousness of the law of works is capable of saving all mankind. If Jesus Christ had not represented a single human creature, still his righteousness would have been what it is, the righteousness of the law. If he had represented the whole, still his righteousness would not have been any thing else than what it is, the righteousness of the law. Should all men reject it, it would still be the righteousness of the law that they rejected ; and should all men accept it, it would be nothing more than the righteousness of the law. It was not the representative character of Jesus in the covenant of grace, but the representative character of Adam in the covenant of works, that rendered the righteousness of that law capable of being imputed to mankind.

And now, reader, I have finished my demonstration, and do honestly believe, that I have proved that the imputability of Christ's righteousness does not depend in any manner, nor in any degree, on his representative character in the covenant. And it would, perhaps, be doing thee no disservice to leave thy difficulty to be solved by thy own ingenuity. Yet I shall just touch it with the wand of truth, to enfeeble it a little ; it is not with the trouble of dissection.

The reason why Adam's merit or demerit was im-

putable, by reason of his representative character—and why the imputability of Christ's righteousness does not depend on his representative character, is this: the former was an *original institute*—the latter a *remedial law*.

Mr. M'C. will understand me. He once studied law; and has enriched our ecclesiastical vocabulary with (what it could well have spared) a *new word* from that source. He can turn to his Blackstone, or any other elementary legal philosopher, on the nature of remedial statutes. He will find the following to be the amount of the doctrine. An original law establishes its own principle: and the covenant of works establishes *its* principle, that the righteousness of Adam, or his guilt, should be transmissible to all mankind. I say this representative principle was established by the covenant of works, and by it alone. I have already discussed that covenant, and shall not repeat my observations. Mr. M'C. thinks otherwise.—Page 26.

“And, now, in what column of this array do you find any other connecting principle than the one which I avowed? We were told, indeed, by Mr. Craig, when this matter was discussed, that the covenant itself is the bond of union.—That is, in plain English, the covenant of works is the bond of the covenant of works. Now I should have supposed that the covenant of works was the bond which united together the *Creator* and the *creature* in a covenant relation; and I should have imagined, that to say so, however orthodox the sentiment, would have been to assert a mere truism which nobody need repeat. But the question is not, what binds humanity in a covenant relation with God? But, what binds all the human race together? What is it that identifies them with Adam, their common

head, so as to render them one with him in the relation in which *he* stood to God? I have named natural generation as the bond; your Confession and catechisms conspire to name it frequently; and they name no other. This your Presbytery have noted as a heresy; and I call upon this Synod to chastise their error."

There is a little good humoured superciliousness in this passage, arising from too great security respecting the strength of his fortress. It turns out, however, in this case, that Mr. Craig was the philosopher. I have proved that Mr. M'C's. principle of union is shadowy, but I cannot dilate: I pledge myself, however, to prove, on a moment's notice, that the natural relations of man, and their moral obligation, though exact correlates, are distinct systems. I shall show you every natural relation, without its correlate moral obligation; and every moral obligation without its correlate natural relation.

The covenant of grace, on the contrary, was a remedial law. If the *principle* of a law be found wrong, or totally useless, through some change in the state of society, the statute is abolished. But if the principle of the law be good and useful, and yet its operation injurious, by reason of some change in society, a remedial statute is introduced; which always allows the principle of the original law to continue in all its original and unmodified force; and provides a remedy against the evils, and means to secure all the good effects of the original institute.

Now, the principle of the law of works was, that its righteousness wrought out by an individual, should be transmissible to all other individuals. This principle is not once touched, changed, or modified by the covenant of grace.



But, owing to a change in the state of society, this principle must have produced the most tremendous effects ; it would have left God without a worshipper among a whole race of rational creatures ; and would have entailed wrath and destruction on every creature that ever should come under the law. This is the evil to be remedied by the remedial law. Let us see by what means it is effected.

1. A new covenant head must be found, and he must possess human nature, because the covenant was made for human nature ; but he must not be a human person, because every human person under that covenant is condemned to death on his own account. But “ O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God—how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.” He sees that his own Son, uniting himself to human nature, and *voluntarily* placing himself under the broken law of the covenant of works, could fulfil its righteousness, which must be a *transmissible* righteousness.

2. It is determined that a seed, definite in number, and known to both parties by name, shall be brought to him by the father, and become heirs of this righteousness, and of the life which is its reward : these the father promises ; and these Jesus accepts as the travail of his soul.

3. Power over all flesh, yea, power over the whole universe is given to the Son of God, that he may give eternal life to as many as the Father hath given him.

This is the remedial covenant ; The condition of it was, on the one hand, that the Son of God should fulfil the broken covenant of works—and on the other, that he should receive the elect as his reward—And power



over the universe, that he may collect these beloved objects at the respective times agreed upon by him and his Father. Now it has always been customary to consider Jesus as bearing a relation to those elected ones, which he does not bear to the non-elect ; as knowing them, delighting in them, coming into the world to save them ; while no such language is used of the others. The texts are not rightly interpreted, which are brought to prove that he knew all men alike as his from all eternity, loved all alike, and came into the world with the design of bringing them all to glory.

The reader, by turning to page 43, will find me pledged to put down the *spectre of imaginary representation*, on its own proper field. This is that field. The two covenants have been viewed as distinct original institutions of similar parts, and proportions, and something must be looked for in the one exactly similar to what is in the other ; and hence as Adam's guilt is imputable, because of his representation, so of course must Christ's righteousness be imputable, in consequence of his representation. But the former covenant only is an original institution ; and therefore its radical principle must be peculiar to itself, and must be *supposed*, not *enacted* in the remedial law.

Mr. M'C has now the means put into his hands of disabusing himself of a mistake which must have given him a prodigious deal of trouble. And perhaps I might safely trust the matter to his own industry. But knowing, as I do, the strong parental storgè that throbs and yearns in the bosom over those children of the brain, how we admire their every feature, mark their bone and muscle, anticipate their future achieve-

ments, live over our life again in theirs, and enjoy the enchanting dream of immortality on earth: when I reflect that in no case, are those feelings more justifiable, more amiable, and more admirable, than when a minister of the gospel verily believes that he has discovered an idea, which will, in some future day, enable many a troubled preacher to expound many a text; which will quench the fiery darts of the devil in many a wounded conscience; which will hammer down the towers of error, that overlook the walls of our Jerusalem; when I consider all these things; and that several others are beginning to contract a fondness for this smiling and promising babe, I beg to be indulged in a little more slow and cool investigation of its merits.

Such investigation has satisfied me, that this is a mere metaphysical deception, and that, like all such, it is at bottom only a word, without any real meaning, and therefore just fit to pick up with some stroll of error on the first occasion.

Let us again tread metaphysical ground. It is very true that Adam represented his own person; and that we then existed substantially. But I apprehend that this is true only in respect to these mortal bodies: begging pardon of the physiologists for trespassing on their grounds, I must deny that our souls existed in Adam in any sense. My soul refuses to acknowledge any father but the Creator of angels and of men,\* the God and Father of Jesus Christ. How little then did actually exist in Adam, only the germs of these animal structures; how much have we by natural generation from him, only the germs of these animal structures, *miris*

\* *Ἀνεβωντὲ θεωντὲ ο παλῆς*, or something like it, says Homer.

*in modis* ; but soon to be a feast to the worms. And this is another proof that I did not decide erroneously, that it is not natural generation that is the bond of our union to Adam in the covenant—for on that supposition he could have represented only our bodies, our souls he could not represent ; and then, on the one hand, bodies without souls were not worth representing, and were incapable of either guilt or righteousness—And, on the other, our souls are perfectly free from Adam's guilt, have no interest in Christ's righteousness, never were under the law of works, nor the law of grace, nor any other moral law. It is therefore a mere figure to say, we *substantially* existed in Adam. I grant that it is a fair figure, for the Scriptures use it ; there was a material unity established by the law of creation, between our bodies and his—And there was a moral unity established between our souls and his, by the law of the covenant. It is, therefore, only figuratively true that we all substantially existed in Adam, that we all are no more than Adam evolved. The proper use of figurative language should be known.

By figurative language only can mental conceptions or general ideas be conveyed to human beings. The philosophy of the human mind has already reached to such a degree of maturity, that we might expect that a system of theology would not be founded on mistaking a figurative term. Yet true it is, that the new system is nothing less or more, than a mistaken figure of speech. I repeat it again, we did not substantially exist in Adam, (using the literal sense of the phrase) for our souls did not exist in him, and therefore we were not represented by him, because we existed in him substantially. And O, that I had time to prove, what I have time only to throw out, probably to



be knocked about as a paradox, I should prove that the moral system of our race was not made for the natural, but the natural for the moral. If the reader can make any thing of this, it is at his service, if not, he can let it alone.

Let me then go on to consider Mr. M'C.'s idea, of the representation of the Son of God. And here he has not even a mathematical point to stand on. The deception which has been effected on his understanding by his imagination, is of the most extraordinary kind. We are all represented by Christ when we believe; because we, in fact, are one with him; and nothing more than Christ evolved. How? Did any one human being ever derive a particle of his body from the Lord Jesus Christ? Did ever one human soul become a part of the soul of Jesus Christ in the day of effectual vocation? Are either our souls or our bodies a part of the divine nature of Jesus Christ? Not at all! The conception of such an idea is impossible. And yet the Scriptures say we are one with Christ, and they use the only language by which the idea can be expressed. But let us, avoiding all hard terms, ascertain how much we really know of this unity; that we may know by what name to call it, and how to interpret it.

God elected men to eternal life, and promised them to him as the travail of his soul: they were therefore one with him in the covenant relation; according to the sovereign will, and solemn sanction of the high contracting parties.

God imputes his Son's righteousness to them, and then they are one with him, being equally justified by the law of works. And yet in this case there is this remarkable difference, that though Jesus pur-



chased a pardon and heaven for them, he did not purchase either for himself.

God sends his Holy Spirit to work upon their hearts—He shows them that Jesus Christ is willing to save them, he inspires them with faith in the Lord Jesus, fills them with love to him and to his Father, and to righteousness. They are one with him in moral righteousness.

And as they wish to be near him, they all offer him their service. Their first cry is, can I render thee any service? What shall I render to my Lord for all his love? The eloquent offers his tongue, the learned his pen, the rich his purse, his house, and his all, the brave offers his sword to defend the sacred ark, for even military courage may be sanctified into a christian grace. And when they cannot serve him by action, why then they offer themselves to suffer for him: they present themselves to hunger and nakedness, to penury and toil, to reproach and shame, to slander and scorn; they offer themselves to the chains of dungeons, and to the contortions of the shameful tree; they offer themselves to be torn by wild beasts, to be tortured by racks, to be sawn asunder, to be burned as candle-wicks. If they cannot have action, they will have suffering in his cause; that they may demonstrate that his love is better than life to them; and exhibit to mankind the more than angelic majesty of a spirit purified by the blood of the Son of God.

But is there in all this any thing more than a mere moral or spiritual unity. I know perfectly what you mean, when you tell me of two friends that they have but one soul. I know all about it: I can conceive a common love, confidence, interest: already I see them engaged in the same cause, rushing into the same dan-

ger, and breathing out their souls together on the same field of battle. You have told me a volume in a metaphor. O call me not to metaphysical abstractions, to let me know in what exact manner their two souls were melted, or glewed into one. And it is as absurd to undertake to show christians are literally one with Jesus Christ, and to prove that thousands were actually melted into one soul. I tell you again there is not one drop of Jesus's bodily blood in one of his saints, there is not a particle of his rational soul in one of them, and here too I must use a metaphor ; and I must have the use of another metaphor to say there is not a particle of his divinity in one of them.

I tell you there is no such thing. I tell you it is all a metaphor and nothing else than a metaphor. And the whole system is, and ever will be, nothing more than a Pyrrhei dance of military metaphors, armed for battle, and dancing on to the charge. I do not say these things with a single atom of triumphant or exulting feeling ; the man who detects such errors forfeits all claim to a triumph over his antagonist—For he never would have detected them, if he had not once been guilty of them.

The Holy Scriptures treating subjects which are the deep things of God ; the divine nature, persons, perfections, and government ; the things of the eternal world ; the employments and operations of angels and arch-angels ; the station in reserve for man, and the manner in which he is to be conducted there ; are under a necessity of dealing largely in metaphors, in order to give men of dust and clay any ideas at all of such sublime themes.

On no subject are metaphors more profusely poured

out, than on the moral or spiritual unity between Jesus and his people.

He is a vine, and they are the branches ; he is the foundation stone, and they are built on him into a holy temple. He is their brother, their redeemer, their master, their prophet, their priest, their king : when the church is represented as a bride, then he becomes the bridegroom. And if the human body be chosen as the object of figurative meaning, of course he must be the head, and they the members. All these metaphors express a real unity ; and fall very far short of the amount of that unity. What man would attempt to find a literal resemblance between any one of them and the thing signified by them all. There is however, one metaphor, and only one in all the Bible, which rises above the sublimity of this unity ; and the reason is, that there is but one more sublime thing within the range of infinite intelligence. The metaphor alluded to is this : *I in them, and they in me, that they may be one in us.* The union of persons in the Sacred Trinity is employed to illustrate the unity of believers with their Saviour. But the metaphor far excels the object illustrated. For the Son of God possesses the very substance, perfection, and glory of the Father, by eternal and necessary generation ; but believers are not at all possessed of the very nature of God, or of his perfections and glory ; though they do possess perfections and glory of their own, bearing some resemblance to his.

I have now examined Mr. M'Chord's Theory of Representation, and do solemnly assure him, that it never will do all, or any one of the many good things he has laid out for it to do : nay, that it never will, and never can do any good of any kind: as it consists intirely



of a misunderstood metaphor. But it may very possibly do a great deal of harm. By unhinging the established religious vocabulary, it unhinges the ideas expressed by words of well known meaning. By introducing a new mode of speech it will introduce endless strifes and confusions of words, and by introducing a false principle it will probably terminate in the denial of the atonement. Never once has that false principle got in a creed without doing mischief; and its direction in this system is towards Socinianism. Your bomb-shell has fallen in the midst of us, and the fuse is blazing, let us try to put it out : it cannot explode without doing who knows what damage.

And now as this scheme is purposely devised to vindicate the moral perfections of Jehovah in respect to the universality of the gospel call, let us proceed to that subject.

## SECTION VII.

### *Of the Universality of the Gospel Call.*

1. The authority which the gospel minister has to preach the gospel to every creature, or to any creature, is the command of his master : “ Go ye therefore and teach all nations ; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” To preach the gospel, is to preach it as a system enforced by divine authority, commanding submission in the name of the Lord Jesus, under the pain of eternal death ; and with a promise of eternal life, to all who shall hear it. The philosophy of the



system, and it has its philosophy, is another affair. Every christian must have sometimes been sensible of an indescribable majesty and authority in the preacher who proclaims the gospel, solely as the word of God ; commanding submission in his name. This I presume is what is meant by preaching it, not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the spirit and with power.

I beg the readers acceptance of the following anecdote, from Cave's *Life of Athanasius*.

"The bishops, before they formally met in the solemn council,\* spent some days in preliminary discourses and disputations;† wherein they were attacked by certain philosophers; men versed in subtilties, and the arts of reasoning, whom either curiosity had drawn thither, or, as some suspect, Arius had brought along with him, to plead his cause, and to retard and entangle the proceedings of the Synod. One of which, priding himself, in the neatness and elegance of his discourses, reflected with scorn upon the fathers of the council. A piece of insolence so intolerable, that an ancient confessor, then in the company, a man plain, and unskilled in the tricks and methods of disputing, not being able to bear it, offered himself to undertake him. For which he was laughed at by some, while others more modest and serious, feared what would be the success of his entering the lists with so able and famed a disputant. The good man, however, went on with his resolution, and bluntly accosted his adversary in this manner. 'In the name of Jesus Christ, philo-

\* Council of Nice.

† Even in the olden time, grave bishops could find leisure to trifle, when they had very weighty business on hand.

sopher, give ear. There is one God, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, who created all these things by the power of his word, and ratifies them by the sanctity of his holy spirit. This word, which we call the Son of God, pitying the apostacy and brutish state of mankind, condescended to be born of a woman, to dwell amongst men, and to die for them ; who shall come again to sit as judge upon whatever we do in this life. These things we plainly believe. Strive not, therefore, to no purpose, to endeavour the confutation of what we entertain by faith, or to find out *how these things may, or may not be* ; but answer me if thou dost believe.' The philosopher, astonished and thunderstruck with the zeal and plainness of the old man's discourse, answered that he did believe ; and thanking that conqueror that overcame him, yielded up himself to his sentiments and opinions, persuading his companions to do the like ; solemnly affirming, that it was by an unspeakable power, and not without immediate direction from heaven, that he was brought over to be a christian."

2. The authority of Jesus to give such a commission, was the commandment of his Father, who gave his Son power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as were given him : for as he says himself, (this commandment received I of my Father). For I came not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.

3. And now the question comes up, where was the candour, where was the truth, where was the justice of Jehovah, in calling on all mankind to believe on his Son.

## SECTION VIII.

*Gospel Call.*

Let us now examine if the new system justifies the moral attributes of Jehovah, and of Jesus Christ, in commanding all men to believe.

And here we meet with something so extraordinary, that I am afraid I shall be accused of employing one of the artifices of controversy in mentioning it. But certain it is, that this is the only system that ever was broached on the subject, which does not authorize the Lord Jesus Christ to command a single sinner to believe on him. Reader, such is the fact; and thou shalt be convinced of it.

The hypothesis is, that Jesus Christ is at the head of a system, which consists of himself, and all those who are vitally united to him by the Holy Ghost. Now, such a system does authorize him to display all his grace—to exercise all his authority over all those who are thus united to him. But does it authorize him to go beyond the limits of his own kingdom; and beat up for recruits in other lands, under other governments? It does not.

Let me use an illustration which Mr. M'C. has employed for another purpose. The government of the United States has a right to govern its own citizens; admit also, that it has a right to naturalize; admit farther, that keeping within its own territory, it has a right to invite the citizens of other governments to come and enjoy the blessings of this nation. And I believe this is the extent of its rights in the case. But



has it a right to send out agents into other lands, to preach rebellion against other governments—to command all men in every country to forsake all that they have, and to remove into the United States; threatening that if this command is disobeyed, the United States will send a great army, cut them all to pieces, and reduce all they have to ashes. Is this totally unwarranted by the essential principles of government? Then I ask if Jesus Christ be only the head of actual believers, what is there in such a system, to authorize him to command all sinners, under pain of eternal death, to accept his salvation? If he has such authority, it is not provided for in Mr. M'Chord's system.

There is a great difference in many respects, between the covenants of works and grace: there is an analogy between them; but analogies do not prevent great and essential differences. The covenant of works covers the whole ground of our animal nature; so that wherever it finds men, it finds subjects. Not so with the covenant of grace: all its subjects are enlisted at the drum head of the captain of their salvation. Now I want to know what authority the new system gives to the Lord Jesus to beat up for such recruits?

Perhaps the answer may be, that regeneration in the new covenant, is the point which analogizes with generation in the old, and that Jesus Christ has a right to assume authority over all that are born of the spirit—true! But what authority had he over them before they were born of the spirit? And what authority can he have over those who are never born of the spirit. Some systems have made no provision for preaching the gospel to the unelected; but this system has made no provision for preaching it to the unconverted, whether elected or not. Thus at every test it fails!



## SECTION IX.

*Of the Capaciousness of the Two Covenants.*

Mr. M'C. has, for some cause or other, found it necessary to prove, in considerable detail, that the covenant of works, in its own nature, and without any respect to the limiting will of God, is capable of comprehending millions of millions of men, for every individual of the human family destined to exist by the sovereign decree of God. And that the covenant of grace, in its own nature, and without reference to any limiting decree of God, would be capable of granting salvation to the whole of all these millions, supposing them all to have fallen from innocence as we have. He also argues out the same principle in relation to human laws and constitutions. And he might, if he chose, have added, that this is essential to the nature of all laws of every kind. The proportionality of four numbers remains the same, though you should multiply each of them by millions. A triangle which you could cover with your thumb, has the same parts, laws and proportions, with a similar triangle, which could take the solar system in its bosom. Were our globe ten times as large as it is, the principle of attraction would keep its particles together ; its revolutions on its axis would give us day and night ; and were every orb in the solar system, ten times as large as it is, there would be no alteration in the astronomy of the system. And new editions of the abstract principles of the astronomers of our little world, would be published for the use of schools, in the mammoth world we are speaking of.

If Mr. M'Cord found himself in circumstances that obliged him to prove that every law possesses this property of infinity, or in other words, that a law is a law, I do sincerely pity him; and, to use a phrase of his own, think he might have been excused "so inglorious an achievement."

He is also perfectly right in asserting that created objects must necessarily be finite in number; and that the number of Adam's descendants are definite, the number to be affected by his covenant definitely fixed by God; and also that the number to be affected by the covenant of grace, is definitely fixed by the same God. And, therefore, since there is not only no contradiction, but no indistinctness of idea on these subjects, we may proceed to another subject, for our object is not controversy, but investigation.

## SECTION X.

### *Of the Individualising System.*

It was with some difficulty that I could comprehend what Mr. M'C. could mean, by saying *individuals* were not included in either of the covenants—that men were not *individually* included; and by calling such a conception the *individualising scheme*. But on comparing several passages together; and finding him very precise in proving that Adam's sin was not such, that being cut up into so many parcels, as that each would suffice to damn an individual, there would be nothing more left; and no more posterity of course born to him; but that the whole of his guilt descends entire to each individual; that the guilt which damns one man, is

sufficient for the condemnation of every individual of the human family ; and would be sufficient to condemn the whole human family, from the first man to the last, though every unit in its millions were multiplied by as many millions more. And when, on the other hand, I found him proving that the sins of every elect individual were not thrown into a common heap, and imputed to Christ Jesus ; and that Jesus Christ did not make such atonement, that being divided into parcels, each parcel would suffice to wash out the sins of an elect soul ; that he did not work out such a righteousness, as being divided into so many parcels, each parcel would, on imputation, save an elect soul, and then he could save no more. But, that on the contrary, it would require the same atonement and righteousness to save one man, as to save all men ; that the righteousness of Christ Jesus goes whole and entire to every believer ; and that the same righteousness is sufficient to save all the millions of the human family, and would be adequate to save the whole, were they as many more. I say on observing all this ; and this is the exact amount of all he has said on the subject, I perceived his meaning. And I did regret that infelicity of human speech, which occasions that what from one man's mouth is accepted as a compliment, should from another man's mouth cause a quarrel. For I will venture to assert, that Mr. M'Chord never did see a man mad enough, and never will see a man mad enough, in the Associate Reformed Church, or out of it, to believe in any such individualisation. Nor is such the doctrine of any man in the Associate Reformed Church, or in the United States, or in the world : notwithstanding that Mr. M'C. so frequently looking his brethren in the face, calls this “ YOUR *individualising*

*scheme.*" Let Mr. M'C. name the man who admitted the imputation of Adam's guilt, and who charged mankind with less than the whole of that guilt! What preacher ever told his hearers, that when the guilt of Adam's sin is divided by the number of his descendants, the quotient resulting is the guilt which each man must answer for! What preacher ever offered the righteousness of Jesus to a sinner, as the ground of his hope, and did not offer the entire righteousness! Who ever told his hearers that when Christ's righteousness is divided by the number of the elect, the quotient resulting is the righteousness to which the believer must trust his soul, when the judge of all the earth unsheaths his flaming sword, and seats himself on the tribunal!

Why then should Mr. M'Chord call this *your individualising scheme*? Will he say it is the consequence of principles which you admit? I assert that even that would not render it *ours*. If the consequences of every opinion were charged on every man who holds it, I do not doubt that every error that ever was in the christian church might be charged on every man in it. But what we reject, what we abhor is not *ours*. Divine justice will never call it *ours*—but controversial justice—why she is of another family.

So intirely is this system of individualisation a creature of Mr. M'C.'s own brain, that I do not recollect ever to have heard of it, or to have read of any thing like it. If ever it was mentioned before, it was mentioned as an absurdity.

Still it may be said, that this absurdity really belongs to *our system*, though it may not belong to *ourselves*: The weakness of our heads has secured the innocence of our hearts; but verily our logic is in fault: and that if we could only reason correctly, we



should be compelled either to swallow the conclusion, or give up the principle. Well then, let us close once more, and let us be cool.

1. We believe, and say, and are ready to prove, that God having created Adam, did enter into a covenant with him, promising to grant him, on a specified condition, life ; and, on the transgression of that specified condition, threatening him with death : which covenant God intended should include every human person descending from Adam, *but whether this intention was at that time declared, we say not, because we know not.*

2. That after the formation of Eve, and her marriage with Adam, and the pronunciation of the blessing of fruitfulness on them both, we presume (though we cannot prove the fact by so many words of scripture,) that Adam was informed by God, that the covenant extended not only to himself, but to Eve, and to every *human person* descending from them.

3. That God at that time had determined in his own mind, what, and how many *human persons* should descend from Adam and Eve ; and at what time, and in what circumstances each should descend ; and had determined that each of these persons, so soon as he should obtain personality, should have a personal interest in that covenant ; so that if Adam should have kept that covenant, such person should be personally justified ; and if Adam should have broken that covenant, such person should be personally condemned.

4. That since the future existence of these persons was decreed by Jehovah ; and their future connection with Adam, and participation in his righteousness and its reward ; or in his guilt, and its punishment ; were also determined by the same immutable will ; we can-

not but think, that they, even then, had a connection with, and interest in, Adam; which non-entities, concerning whom Jehovah decreed that they should remain non-entities to all eternity, could not have.

5. Now this connection between Adam and his predetermined descendants, is what we view, when we say that Adam was their covenant head; that Adam was their representative.

And what is there in all this about dividing Adam's guilt into shreds according to the number of his posterity? We suppose that if he dies, they die: and if they die as well as he, we presume, and we say, that they were as guilty as he. We do not want a Beccaria to instruct us that the Infinite Judge of all the earth proportions punishments to crimes. From equality of punishment, we infer equality of guilt.

But if any one will insist on making this a mathematical question, to mathematics let us go. And then we get the following ratio: Supposing (by hypothesis) that Adam and his descendants amount to a million, a very small calculation; but mathematicians know that the doctrine of ratios does not depend on the particular value of antecedents and consequents.

We have the following proportion,

$$\text{As Adam's sin : Death : : } \frac{\text{Adam's sin}}{1,000,000} : \frac{\text{Death}}{1,000,000}$$

That is, for readers who are not mathematicians ought to know something about this subject, each of the million in the covenant was guilty of one millionth part of a sin, and shall suffer the one millionth part of death. Reader, thou mayest pronounce this any thing but sense or argument.

But who is guilty of this nonsense? We assert that if one million of men (according to hypothesis) were

included by God, in an aggregate number, to be affected by Adam's sin or righteousness; then, since the whole includes all its parts, one million of men includes one million individuals of mankind: and we say, if each one of these individuals die for this single sin of Adam, then was each man guilty of that one sin. Therefore each individual of the million was guilty of the one sin of Adam.

Mr. M'C. seems to think, that the decree of Jehovah, and even his sacred covenant, are worth nothing; and leave their objects among the non-entities, which are decreed ever to remain non-entities. Let me propose him a problem—Have the bodies of the saint's, now in their graves, any interest in the resurrection of the just, and the glories of the heavenly state, which the bodies of sinners have not? If so, does it arise from the covenant of grace?

In relation to the covenant of grace, we believe, and have believed, since the days of the reformation, and I pledge the man who says to the days of the apostles, or as far back as he pleases to go—We believe that the eternal Father and his Eternal Son, foreseeing from all eternity (for what can be hid from infinite wisdom, which knoweth all that can be known) that Adam would transgress the covenant; and yearning with bowels of infinite compassion, such bowels as mortal man knoweth not, nor can know, over a poor, foreseen, lost race—of noble powers and high destinies; did determine to interpose: and to show to surrounding spheres, what is MERCY, and did solemnly covenant and vow to each other as follows.

That if, on the one hand, the Eternal Son should pledge his truth and honour to assume human nature into a personal union with his divine, and should vo-

luntarily submit himself to the broken law ; should endure the penalty incurred by Adam's sin, should fulfil the righteousness of the law by obeying its every precept.

Then, on the other hand, he should receive as his reward, a certain number of the whole race ; to be given him, some in this age, some in the next, some in the succeeding age, and so on till the last of the race should be born, and should have finished his destined course on earth.

And that he should have full authority and power over the whole race of mankind, and over the world which they inhabit ; that he might pick out each one at the day and hour appointed ; that he should have authority to command any and all the angels of God, and the whole created universe of God, to render him any assistance, they could, in recovering and preserving to eternal life, this travail of his soul ; And that he should have the command and direction of the Infinite Spirit of God, to enlighten, purify, and sanctify these destined ones, and bring them to glory.

And in relation to all mankind, that since they were under the law, and since he had pledged himself to work out the righteousness of the law, he should give them a free offer of that righteousness, as he should see cause.

And finally, that all who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved.

All this we profess to believe—And it has, in a good degree, been the faith of the professing church of God from the beginning. And we are too tender of the honour of our intellectual reputation, not to stake the whole of it in this cause. We do believe that the Eternal Father, and his Eternal Son, equally omni-



scient, did intend that the new covenant, or the eternal covenant of grace, (we have proved it to be eternal) should save a definite number of mankind—(ask God why not all!) And as we (by hypothesis) supposed that a million were included in Adam's covenant; so we shall suppose (by hypothesis) that half a million is included in the covenant of grace—God forbid that this ratio should not be too small—(and no man can prove by the Scriptures that it is not) we are not ashamed to say, that we believe, that if God saves half a million of men, he must save half a million of individual men: that if half a million men were pledged as the travail of the Redeemer's soul, in the eternal covenant of grace, (for we have proved it to be eternal) then half a million of individual men were pledged. And again, we stake our intellectual reputation on the assertion, that those who were thus given by the Father, and accepted by the Son, and known to both, did stand in a relation to that Son, different from the rest of mankind. Call him their *covenant head*—call him their *representative* if you will—call him by any relative name you will—we again stake our intellectual reputation on the assertion that his relation to the travail of his soul, to those who were given him to be saved, is different from the relation he bore to those who were not given him to be saved.

If after all we are pronounced incapable of perceiving the truth of an *axiom*, we must console under the mortifying imputation, by reflecting that Mr. M'C. is just as ill of as we. For as no axiom can be proved by argument; and as men of common sense cannot perceive the intuitive light of his axiom, it follows that Mr. M'C. will never be able to reveal his discovery by

any species of intellectual process. It seems to be an axiom intended for the sole use of the inventor.

It is now too late to call in question, whether the glorious reformation, in which God said, let there be light, and there was light: and intellect burst her chains, and religion poured her light; and science burst forth into birth; and tyranny shrunk back; and the spirit of liberty waved her flag, and cried, to arms, *my sons*, to arms; when Europe was regenerated, to become the regenerator of the world. It is too late to enquire whether this was the work of God! Can I believe that the Melancthons, and the Luthers, and the Morrells, and the Calvins, and the Jewels, and the Owens, and twenty others, whom I could name, and a thousand others of whom I have never heard, did not understand the gospel. In reading their works I have often paused and palpitated, and asked what has become of this race of noble blood? Were they all Monks? Have they no sons at all? In this age, scarcely can be found a man who holds a lamp that can show us how to step over a gutter: those held lamps that shed light over half a world. How were they so great? Surely God poured on them his spirit in no ordinary degree—surely they studied the holy word—surely they prayed for the spirit of illumination when they studied. I find them expressing for each other a manly esteem; and I see them interchanging the side-long-glance of love, in a way that lovers only can see: but I have not found a single puff at each other, in all that I have read of them. Indeed they were made of too weighty metal to be puffed up by the breath of mortal man. And am I to be told that these men did not understand the gospel? Am I to be told that they

“chattered” the gospel call in terms that made Jesus Christ a cheat and a liar.

I do not say that they were always right. God left so much human frailty in them, as warns us to depend not on *them*, but on his *own spirit and word*.\* In some instances I think them wrong, and then, with timid step, I take a different way. But never have I told, and never shall I tell, the public, that I learned the way to truth by my father’s errors. No, ye heroes, if ever I name your name, save for praise, may my name rot.

The churches of the reformation were, I hope, not wrong in any essential point of doctrine, worship, or practical law. I hope so, because I am sure, that if the case be otherwise, I shall never live to see the error rectified. Is it possible to believe that the glorious churches of Switzerland—that the glorious churches of France, and of Holland—that the glorious churches of England, and of Scotland, and of Ireland, and of the United States of America; that all these churches, and all their anointed instructors, the lights of the world, should all of them, and every man of them, all this time have been proclaiming the gospel in terms which make God a cheat and his Son a liar! It cannot be! This new discovery must be a strife of words. The fathers were right: and instead of their gospel, you have offered you A METAPHOR, METAMORPHOSED INTO A METAPHYSIC.

I shall pursue the new theory no farther.

It is not absolutely impossible to form a veri-similitude conjecture of the causes which have produced

\* Their doctrine I believe to be always right—when they chanced to slip in a bit of philosophy, a system, it was wrong.

this new system. We find here and there some glorious ideas, the result of long analysis, beyond the years and mental training of Mr. M'C. were his talents ten-fold what they are. We are sure these ideas are not the result of his researches, because we see that he does not know what to do with them. When they are put together with other materials, the whole resembles nothing so much as a modern Mahomedan structure in Greece, where a fine piece of antique sculpture is found in the wall turned up side down, and a Corinthian pillar is found supporting a wretched hovel.

I say not this to disparage Mr. M'C.'s talents ; for I know, and very willingly say, that he possesses very respectable talents ; and talents which, if rightly used, are well calculated to render him a very useful man, in the latitude and longitude, in the soil and climate, where Divine Providence has placed him. But whether they are the talents of an *Investigator* of Truth, it is hard to say. The present specimen is unfavourable ; but it is not decisive of the question, by any means. The *advocate* of truth, however, has his own glory, as well as the *investigator*. Neither are the two characters quite incompatible. The *Advocate* may grow into an *Investigator*. But it is to be feared that there is some immutable law of our nature, which has decreed that no man shall, at the same period of his days, excel in both. To this law there are, to say the least, few exceptions. And Dr. Goldsmith spoke truth, when he said of Edmund Burke, that Proteus of genius, that his trade was to *cut blocks with a razor*. Of one of the characters spoken of, the world needs but few ; of the other it can never have too many.

THE ADVOCATE of Truth, is a man of masculine



port and nervous arm: his open brow and sparkling eye, indicate the honesty of his intentions: quick of perception, irritable of feeling, in fancy versatile, enthusiastic in all things. He fears nothing: and why should he fear. He mounts the Pulpit: he pours on his audience the direct ray of plain Gospel truth: he appeals to their understanding, and they know it—he appeals to their heart, and they feel it; he brings forward—not the objections of a drivelling logician—created only to be damned—but the objections which the true orator reads in the eyes and in the hearts of his audience. He states these objections in more tremendous form than ever they appeared in before. The audience is terrified—they tremble for themselves—they tremble even for the preacher. He touches the spectres with the wand of truth, they are gone! His soul takes fire, his audience are on fire. They see more than they see, they know more than they know, they are more than themselves. He spreads his pinions, and spurns the earth, and away they are all gone together in the whirlwind.

Such a man is worth—but his Master will estimate his worth. He has always this singular felicity, that he is the *immediate* instrument of good to mankind. He sees himself surrounded by his children, and his children's children. He sits under the trees which his own hand has planted, and plucks and eats their fruit. He enjoys his honours in his own days: and, provided God receives supreme glory as the author of all, I protest I cannot see why it should be a sin, to exult in the consciousness of having merited well of one's kind; and delighting in the thought, that God has given mankind grace enough to acknowledge their obligations.

For such men, in this country, and at this day, there is a great demand: and they are the only class of the intellectual breed for whom there is any demand.

THE INVESTIGATOR of truth is a very different character. Occasionally pale, occasionally hectic; always thoughtful, pensive, absent, lost, absorbed, fond of solitude. His ardour has nothing to do with the blood or the passions; it is kindled entirely by the will, by a deliberate, stubborn determination that he *will* know the truth. His courage is of a singular character: it consists in an awful terror of being defeated. Having formed his determination, he buckles on his knapsack, with a few mathematical instruments in it, takes his staff in his hand, and bidding adieu to the whole human race, places himself in the very middle of the highway, and steps off, with the earth beneath his feet, the heavens over his head, and the God, who made both the heavens and the earth, his sole companion, and his only trust. He proceeds slowly, marking every thing, till coming to a place, where the road has been strewed with trees torn up by a hurricane, and greatly injured by torrents, and looking to one side, he sees a fine open way, and reads on the finger board *this is the road*—and hastily taking it he proceeds. He comes to a lofty structure, and reads a name in LARGE CAPITALS. I am right, he cries. This is a triumphal pile, erected, to the glory of some mighty chief, who on this spot reaped the laurels of victory in the cause of truth. On he goes, and passes many such monuments; but at last he finds himself between two mountains, towering perpendicularly to the heavens, and a dark, noisome gulf before him, he can advance no further!

Reader, he went out in search of truth, and he has

not lost his labour—He has discovered, that the truth which he is in quest of, is not to be found in that road, and that no man ever will find it there. He has solved one problem, he knows he is wrong; but how did he get wrong? This is his next problem. He retraces his steps, and now he reads, as he returns, the whole of the inscriptions on the monuments; and to his utter amazement, finds that these are all of them, the tombs of mighty chiefs, who in times of old had encamped with their armies on these spots; and had perished during the night, by some pestilential vapours peculiar to the soil. He hastens on to the *finger-post*, and finds the whole inscription to be this, *The road to destruction*.

Placing himself once more in the very middle of the high way, he moves right forward, and after infinite toil, at last surmounts every obstacle, and finds himself in the right road. Willingly would he repair the breach, and remove all the obstructions, but he is unable; and his duty calls him to go forward. But before he proceeds, he notes accurately the longitude and latitude of the spot; and then commits himself once more to his journey. And thus he proceeds, night and day, through winter's cold and summer's heat; in all winds and all weathers, some times lost in wrong roads, often in the right; and sometimes in the dismal darkness of the night, under the pitiless pelting of the storm, he begins to doubt whether there be any road at all, till he recollects that he is sure he once was in it; sometimes in the desperate agonies of his heart, he is tempted to wish he never had heard there was a road, till at last he is relieved from his doubts, and catches a momentary glance of the path by the flashes of the lightning of heaven.

Reader, the number of men who set out on this journey is probably greater than we imagine ; but many of them are lost in the false ways, and many of them breathe out their souls in the true way, solitary and unknown. Like Houghton and Parke, they perish in the noble attempt to trace a path by which civilization may travel into the abodes of horrid cruelty ; but unlike Houghton and Parke—*etiam periere ruine*—their very names have perished.

Should one of these travellers live to return home after his circumambulation, he finds himself a stranger in his own land. When his neighbours see him seated in his own plain cottage, drinking only the water of the same well, and feeding on the fruit of the same tree, as in his youth ; they are apt to consider him as a weak and visionary man, who gave himself a great deal of trouble to little purpose. But the censure is not entirely well-founded. For he sits more securely in his cottage than formerly, knowing that it is the only one on earth, that is thunder proof ; he drinks of his spring more copiously, because he knows that its waters alone know no poisonous mixture, no impure sediment ; and eats his fruits with greater delight, because he is sure that they grew on the tree of life. And though the aged may have grown too wise to need his instruction, he may have an opportunity of warning their children to stay at home in their own native land ; which is the glory of all lands. But if any one of them should determine to see the world for himself, the old traveller hands him his map, bids him God speed, and prays earnestly for his safe return.

But reader, lest thou shouldst think that I carry thee too far out of thy road ; I shall carry thee right into the middle of the Calvinistic churches.



When I see a new moral theory springing up in other churches and denominations, I care little about the matter ; considering the theorist to be, among his party, a very innoxious animal. But when I see a theorist among Calvinists, I tremble. This oddity of temperament ; or, as the great American physician would call it, this idiosyncrasy of constitution, has arisen, I suspect, from the following causes. The peculiar attribute which has distinguished the Calvinistic sect, in all nations, and in all ages, is a firm and stubborn faith. I use these epithets in their fullest and most favourable sense ; a Calvinist will believe God's word, but he will believe nothing else, in matters of religion. Talk to him of the decisions of ten thousand councils, he cares nothing about them, and indeed, rarely gives himself trouble to know any thing about them. Talk to him of moral theories, expand their beauties, display their uses : he listens patiently, and when you have done, laconically quotes at you a text of scripture. In short, the head of a Calvinist is bullet proof against any cannon of any calibre, unless the bullet be a text of scripture. This is not satire. It is only truth with a benevolent smile ; and I treat that lady, as I do all her sex, I prefer her smiles to her frowns by far. I mention it to the honour of that section of the christian church ; and I mention it as the great secret of their characteristic firmness in doctrine, and other matters connected with doctrine.

But causes produce effects. And this characteristic devotion to faith has been the cause, that while no sect has been so rich in sound theologians, who have taught the pure doctrines of the gospel, who have enforced its pure morality, who have conducted afflicted souls through all the mysteries and mazes of Satanic tempt-

ations, and saintly feelings and experience ; no sect has been so poor in moral philosophers. I cannot recollect the name of one single moral philosopher in the whole, I mean a philosopher with a theory. Whenever such a philosopher has appeared, he has led off his column from the army, and formed a new encampment, at first bidding defiance to his ancient friends, and afterwards making war on them. Such were Arius, Socinus, Wesley, Priestley, and others. I mention these names only as exemplifications of the fact, that a Calvinist with a new theory always leads off his column from the grand army ; but I protest against ranking them together as equals.

Perhaps the instance of president Edwards may be quoted against me ; but I do not think it ought. He was the cause, he sowed the seed, of the Hopkinsian sect ; but if he were back on earth, with the principles he had when he left it, he would not join those who call themselves his pupils. And even he is a strong proof, that the moment a Calvinist turns philosopher, there is a danger of a schism. Is the doctrine of the bible then in opposition to philosophy ? No : That is not my meaning. It is philosophical, most philosophical ; infinite wisdom cannot establish a constitution which shall not be infinitely philosophical.

But my meaning is, that the philosophy of Christianity is by far too vast and too profound to be understood, till the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of the human mind, and the philosophy of man in general, as a sentient, intelligent, social being, has made great advances. We can, however, enjoy Christianity without its philosophy : as Pliny enjoyed the sun, when his philosophy had ascertained no more than that it was just a little bigger than Mount Athos. I can eat my dinner without being a chymist, or a phi-

sologist. I can enjoy the light of the sun, whether I believe he moves or stands still. By looking in the almanac, I can tell when it will be flood tide at market street wharf, whether I can calculate the moon's situation in her orbit or not ; and it is the easiest course ; and the very one that the best astronomer in the city of Philadelphia would resort to. Go to your Bible for the rule of your faith, and leave Jesus Christ to answer for its philosophy : assure yourselves that he who is the wisdom of the Father, will, in the end, flout at the wisdom of those who impeached the philosophy of his gospel.

Jonathan Edwards had all the talents requisite to form a systematic moralist : acuteness and grasp of intellect, coolness and patience in investigation, a thorough power of reading all that was going on in his own bosom, great acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, great experience of the work of the holy spirit on his own heart, much experience of the ingratitude, injustice, and cruelty of men ; he loved truth, he adored truth as an attribute of his God ; he felt the power of investigating truth to be the peculiar talent God had given him, and was as free as any man from base ambition and vanity. Every one of these elements is essential to the composition of a systematic moralist.\*

\* Ought not *good humour* to be added to this enumeration of the elements of a good metaphysician ? Thirty years ago, the great Dr. Reid was *emeritus professor* of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow : whenever he appeared on the walks of the college green, every eye was turned to him ; every student gave the word, there's Dr. Reid. And yet his great talents and science were never thought of. His gentleness, his kindness, his simplicity, his amiability, made the whole impression. It was not the great man that was admired, but the good man, the good old



But he went to work too soon. In his days, the philosophy of mind was in babyhood. He laboured also under some hallucinations of mind, which have led astray many of the ablest of the human race. He went out in quest of a radical truth, a radical virtue; from which all truth, all virtue, must descend, by legitimate logical deduction. And he seems to have thought, that if we have an absolutely certain knowledge of two truths, it must be possible to trace the connecting links which bind them together. The sect which sprung out of his tomb, is celebrated for extreme logical subtlety; and use weapons so delicately pointed, that nobody but themselves can see their point, nor be absolutely certain whether they have any point at all. But their conclusions confound and terrify. Like Hobbes, the best logician ever England produced, they land you in conclusions that you are sure are wrong.

The churches are in awful troubles. Satan has great wrath, because he knows his time is short. And he manages with admirable dexterity. This is a philosophical age, and men will think, and

patriarch, the grandfather of them all, that they venerated and loved. Bishop Berkley was a most chivalrous philanthropist. John Locke was a good humoured facetious companion. Who ever saw in the christian church, an ill-natured man, who had the slightest pretensions to the name of a metaphysician? On the contrary, all the deistical and atheistical metaphysicians are ill-natured and malignant—selfish, retiring within their own shell; without friendship; their ambition, their interest, engrossing all their soul. So destitute of affection to their kind, that they cannot love even a woman:—so conscious of dishonesty, that they can trust nobody; and hence few of them ever marry. They wrote their systems for their own fame and profit, and to do evil to a race they cordially hated. They mixed their poisons because they intended to kill.



thought discovers truth, and truth is naturally promotive of piety, virtue, peace and happiness; it is his policy, therefore, to corrupt truth at its fountain. He is taking the brilliant discoveries of this age, in all sorts of philosophy, and converting them into machines to batter down the fortress of the christian faith, or to corrupt its fountains by deleterious infusions. To arms then, ye sons of the brave : but let no man rein a steed on this field who cannot establish his title to that honour, by the scars and experience of twenty campaigns. One who has the true *coup d'œil* ; one who can estimate his enemies' force as well as his own; who sees at a glance the meaning of every movement, and quicker than lightning, has a counter movement to meet it ; one who knows and has poised every weapon on each side of the war. But keep back the youth, or rather let them have the discretion to keep back themselves. One of them will do more harm than a hundred of them are worth.

Willingly would I suppress what I am going to say, could I reconcile the suppression to a sense of duty. But somebody must be found to tell young preachers their duty, on the same terms that they impress duty on the consciences of their audience—eternal responsibility to the Son of God. And I wish the application to be as extensive as the applicability of the remarks. I would tell young preachers, then, that Jesus Christ has sent them to preach his holy gospel, to gather in the travail of his soul, to feed his lambs, to visit the forsaken, to find out the forgotten, and to bind up the broken hearted. And they are to preach his gospel as his own word, sanctioned by his own authority ; and not to permit themselves to be questioned why, and how, and wherefore these things can be. While you

are engaged in these holy and delightful duties, give yourselves much to meditation and prayer ; to deep meditation on your own hearts, and constant searching of the holy word. Feeding on such angels' food, who can tell how great you may grow?

But I tell you what he has not sent you to do. He has not sent you to make new systems of theology or philosophy—he cannot have sent you to do what it is impossible you should be competent to perform. How many years have you spent searching the Holy Scriptures in the fear of God? How many years have you patiently toiled in examining the philosophy of your age, and testing it by the inspired word? And yet you say you have a new system already!

Don't let your youthful inexperience deceive you. Depend upon it, that all the fine systems which shine with such lustre to the enraptured imagination of youth, will not be found to be of God. Depend upon it, there hang up, like models of perpetual motions in the cabinets of the curious—there hang up in the heads of all men who have ever troubled their heads with moral speculations, a great many moral systems, and fine theories. They laboured long on them, they proportioned them curiously, filed and polished them to the utmost, and put them firmly together. And now the decisive moment being come, the artist, with palpitating bosom, puts his machine in motion, and it moves, and the inventor bounds to the ceiling.

This is true glory, for he has done what never was done before! And it will be an admirable present to mankind. It will abolish all wind-mills and water-mills; watch-springs, and clock pendulums, and steam engines. And, in the coming age, nothing in this wide world will move but itself—And then begins the

millenium. Dear delusions, I love you though I laugh at you. You too have your uses.

Now all the systems which improve the christian religion are precisely these perpetual motions, issued and uttered in the moment that the enthusiasm of the inventor was in its delirium. Men more cautious let the machine stop, and try it again and again, and at last finding that it always comes to rest, place it on the shelf. Frequently the same artist lives to finish half a dozen of them. But he gives it up at last as a bad business, locks up his work shop, and puts the key in his pocket. Now he will not let a young artist into his workshop, lest he should fall in love with one of these machines, and either steal it, or go home and make something like it. But when he meets an artist who has laboured at the trade, and given it up fairly, they go in, and laugh at their folly, and wonder how like to wisdom folly can look ; and how very much the follies of different men may resemble each other.

But to speak of religious systems with great seriousness. I believe that Satan is permitted to lead thoughtful minds, with the most upright and honest intentions, into these whimsical speculations ; and that if they are cool and cautious they will be brought off honourably ; and be brought to see a more excellent way. And even the time spent in system making will not be lost to them ; they will be put on their guard respecting the tremendous cunning of that adversary with whom all must contend, but, beyond all, the ambassadors of the cross. They will, by a few such instances, learn how, and by what means Christianity is corrupted. It is (speaking respecting its doctrine) seeking after the philosophy of that doctrine : God tells us things are so ; and we go to ask *how* these things are so : and not



finding the law of the system, we frequently destroy the bodies which compose it. That men are free agents, is one scripture doctrine ; that the grace of God is infallibly efficacious, is another scripture doctrine ; *how* can these things be, we cry ? And in searching after this law of the system, one party finds it convenient to deny free will in order to establish their law—and the other balances the account by denying free grace. The Scripture tells us, that all Adam's descendants are guilty of his sin, and liable to its punishment. *How* does the sin become theirs, we cry ? Now this is a philosophical question—And it has been answered, that it flows down in the blood. Now this assertion, if it were true, is no part of Christianity, it belongs to the philosophy of Christianity. And I have demonstrated, that this is false philosophy. Yet Mr. M'C. brings this false philosophy into his system. What that system may turn out no soul can divine. It is in the egg ; but when hatched it will be a serpent, and bite. That Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers, and procures for them eternal life, is the scriptural doctrine. But all demur and ask, *how* can it be imputed ? Now I assert that this question entirely relates to the philosophy of Christianity. The *reason why* a thing is so, is nothing else than a philosophical question. And if nobody could believe in Jesus Christ, except those who can enter into the fine metaphysical doctrine respecting representation, there would not be one Christian for a thousand that now praise this Redeemer. All your charming babes, boy and girl, who chaunt their Redeemer's praise must be pronounced incapable of believing. Does one of them know any thing about the *reason why* Christ's righteousness can be imputed to them ? O poor babes, the stones in



the street know as much of the matter as they. Yet they believe in Jesus, and his righteousness. The gospel was given, to be preached to the poor, to the illiterate, to lisping babes, but we preach it in a manner that only philosophers can understand : and some of us in a manner which philosophers themselves cannot understand.

The answer to this philosophical problem comes up again and fires my blood. It is said his righteousness may be ours *because he represented us*. I have *demonstrated* this to be a piece of false philosophy. And I pronounce it one of the most pestilent pieces of false philosophy, with which the chief of the fallen hosts ever corrupted the christian church. It was one of his most masterly strokes of generalship to bring the church on that ground. Against this wicked philosophy I raise the hue and cry. I lift up my voice like a trumpet, and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ I call on the whole christian church to hunt this wisdom of the devil out of the world. I call on all gospel ministers, upon whom God has conferred the power of accurate discrimination, to bring this philosophy to the test. Whatever they may have heretofore thought, or said, on this subject, I call upon them to *test* it again. It is a doctrine of the devil and not of God.

If you ask me what is the grand error of the reformation churches, what has produced most schism, most controversy, most malignity, and been worse than any thing else, or all things else ; I name this philosophical doctrine, that Christ's righteousness is imputable to men, *because he represented them in the covenant of grace*. Look back to page 54, &c. and see how many sects, and of what class and character, have

sprung from this doctrine. To these add the numerous other sects that have sprung out of these sects, and then say what ought to be thought of this Satanic philosophy.

I cant say by which one of the reformers this piece of philosophy was introduced into the church. The idea which presents itself to my imagination, concerning the mode of its introduction is this. I conceive one of the old reformers sitting writing on the subject of justification by faith ; and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him, whispers the question, *how* can the righteousness of the Son of God be imputed to a mortal man? And making a hasty reply, perhaps whispered to him, the reformer wrote down in the first glow of approving thought, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers because he represented them in the covenant.

Be this as it may, thus much is certainly known, that the doctrine of justification by faith in the blood of Christ was *the doctrine* of the reformation.

Even a politician states this as the *doctrine*, the *soul*, the *cause* of the reformation : as creating a new society all over Europe ; as giving in every kingdom existence to a society, all of which were bound together by this common faith ; and felt its influence like the influence of the heart, in the animal system, extending to the remotest members, and even to the slightest excrescences. He represents this principle or doctrine, as giving their societies all the effect of corporate and political organization a unity of object, a unity of interest, a unity of affection, a unity of co-operation. Touch this doctrine, in any one nation, and the electric shock was felt, at the same instant, over all the nations of Europe, by every individual of

the same faith. And when that doctrine was attacked, no tie of kindred, or of blood, no tie of allegiance, no tie of patriotism, could bind a member of that society. They felt only for their society : This attacked doctrine was their Palladium, their ark, their all in life, in death, through eternity. It was the cause of God, and of man, and of the universe. These are the views of a politician. But he was a politician whose eye ranged over the whole of human society, through all its various organizations, and its mysterious and interwoven ramifications ; and while it ranged over the whole, it penetrated to the centre of each, and perceived, and estimated, the individual momentum, and particular direction of the individual forces, whose united power produces what is called the state of society. It was the opinion of Edmund Burke, but what is most to our purpose is, that it is the truth.

Satan had vanquished the heroes of old, on the field of wordly ambition. I have no doubt, that at that time, he vanquished them by drawing up their own sons against them ; youths full of genius, fire, and metal ; fond of speaking, and fond of premature influence. To behold the church passing from persecution to protection, from protection to influence, and from influence to power, wealth, honour, titles, dignities, supremacy ; must certainly have conveyed to vulgar minds, an idea of a prosperous and flourishing condition. And I don't doubt but when the old father exclaimed in the counsel, "*This day I see poison brought into the church,*" there was a fine, eloquent, ardent youth, who arose, and demonstrated that there was no danger at all in the new reformation. "What ! moderator, (would he say) can there be any danger in the new reformation ? You have been long complaining of pover-



ty, and here is wealth for you : you have been praying to God to deliver you from persecution, and here is more than deliverance, here is political power. It is promised that kings shall be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers to the church, and lo the promise fulfilled, they put us to the breast ! It is written that the saints shall inherit the earth, and now that it is offered us, shall we refuse it. I greatly venerate, moderator, my very venerable and worthy father, who has just spoken. But, really sir, I much doubt if he be as capable of judging of the state of things, in the present times, as he was fifty years ago. The state of society is vastly altered, all things are improved, and I think it will be prudent, and were I answering to my equal, I should think it no more than justice, for those who are just stepping out of the church, and out of the world, prudently and timeously, and with a good grace, to surrender a little of the direction of both into younger and more vigorous hands."

Well sir, the reformation took place. The fiend triumphed, and left it to the church, with her own hand, to complete a system of tyranny, that left mankind no liberty in the use of any one faculty of soul or body.

But in the true reformation, of which we are speaking, the fiend saw the regeneration of the world. He saw a tremendous sight—the blood of Jesus proclaimed aloud by a thousand tongues—his spirit shed on tens of thousands: the Holy Scriptures their daily study, translated into their own languages ; and their own languages the vehicle of their praises and their prayers : and their high, their lofty claim, the liberty of ordering the whole of their conduct according to the prescriptions of that word alone. Could Satan view such a scene without dismay ! He



saw that in a very short time, they would sweep ignorance, superstition, and tyranny in all its forms, out of Europe, and out of the world ; he saw that they multiplied faster than all his tyrants, of both breeds, could kill them. He therefore fell upon a new plan. He must make themselves the instruments of their own ruin. How ? not by chopping off toes and fingers, not by slitting noses and cropping ears, but by corrupting their blood at the fountain of the heart. By corrupting their GRAND DOCTRINE, justification by the righteousness of Christ. The doctrine itself could not be denied all at once. The whole body of the reformed believed it, and had a thousand texts of Scripture to support it ; and would have given up their whole religion, their Bibles, and all their hopes, the moment they gave up this doctrine. And that was a sacrifice he knew they could not, and would not make. And if they kept that doctrine, he might annoy, but he could not triumph over them. They would reach the portals of glory at last. Corrupted it must be. But how ? By making them philosophers, by starting questions which they cannot answer, and whenever they give an ignorant answer, accept it, get it into their creed, into their pulpits, into all their ideas respecting divine things : and then, getting a philosopher of fine brain, and logical talents, and making him take their own foolish philosophy, and argue it against them, and show them that by the laws of that intellect which God has given them, if they reason from their own principles, they must in the end, give up some part of God's truth.

The event was well calculated. In all this we are only supposing the devil to have been a good logician. And every logician knows, that one of the finest trips within the wrestling ring of sophistry, consists in ask-

ing a question, and if the respondent answers wrong, don't touch him yet—ask him to prove its connection with the truth which he is defending, and you impugn; he does it ardently, and as he imagines irrefutably. The sophism is now, by the chemical attraction of the imagination, identified with the truth. But if you are a true sophist, don't touch him yet :—ask him again what good consequences will flow from the whole. He proves one good consequence and another, and these generate other consequences. Now clench him. Revive the answer to your first question, demonstrate from other principles, that it is absolutely wrong, he will struggle, but he must submit at last; and you cut up all his fine consequences, and the truth which he united to them, shares their fate. You have triumphed; and so triumphs the fiend, when he cheats the gospel minister in a little bit of false philosophy, and persuades him to mingle it with the churches food; the pure gospel of Christ.

It may be said that the particular idea which has given rise to this whole discussion, and has been treated as so dangerous a sophism, and false philosophy, is to be found in the writings of the most distinguished chiefs of the Calvinistic churches, and is heard in the sermons of most Calvinistic preachers. It must be admitted that this is matter of fact. And though I am not quite sure that it is altogether innoxious there—for it has generated questions, whether the essence of saving faith consists in believing that Jesus Christ died intentionally to save ME—it has created troubles in many honest, anxious hearts, respecting their RIGHT to believe the gospel—and some things else perhaps: yet it has been, in a great degree, neutralised by the stubborn faith, the glorious characteristic of the Cal-

vanistic family. For although consequences after consequence, in a train of argument, should be carrying a Calvinist towards the gulph of error, the moment he gets his foot on a text of Scripture which he understands, he recovers his feet. How he got there, perhaps he knows not, perhaps he cares not, but he is sure he is right.

Perhaps I may be cautioned, that there are among those who hold this idea, men who are unquestioned philosophers, on every ground within the range of liberal science, and no where so much philosophers as on the ground of Christianity. I rejoice in asserting that it is so : and did I not know that they are a magnanimous race, who love truth, and love the man, who utters it, I should blush for my own insignificance, while I thus speak.

After all, preaching the philosophy of Christianity, is not preaching the gospel. Perhaps there is too much preaching of this philosophy of Christianity. I do not presume to judge the men who are capable. *They* are capable of judging for themselves ; but I give my opinion. That it is imprudent and dangerous to preach the philosophy of Christianity, unless on the ground, and at the time, that the devil's philosophy is publicly, and from the pulpit, troubling the church. In that case you have no choice, you must gaff chicken against chicken, the true philosophy, against the false, and look on—never fear, there is no doubt of the *main*.

I said I trembled for the day when Calvinists should turn philosophers, and let the churches look to it and tremble too. It is this philosophy of Christianity which we too often hear, and always complain that we do not understand it. And this very philosophy of Christianity is most frequently taken up by our young-



est men, that's the danger. God knows in what a manner they frequently manage the matter ! You shall see a youth just licensed, assuming the most dangerous positions in all the wide universe of Christianity, and challenging to conflict, single-handed, the most fearful champions that ever the devil sent to hew down the armies of the living God.

If this plain speaking should be received with a sneer, as if it were only the result of the vanity of age irritated by the vanity of youth, let them cry—Go up bald head !—In defiance of what mortal man can think or say of me, I tell the young, and tell the old, and I tell the whole of you, that this everlasting preaching of the philosophy of Christianity by all sorts of men of all sizes, will work mischief. We have got one theorist already, and perhaps some other may be just putting on, and flapping his wings, for an aerial flight. O be admonished, and keep the ground, remember the fate of Icarus. The pinions you have, are borrowed pinions, and they are stuck together with wax ; and assuredly they will melt, and down you come.

*Nititur pennis vitro daturus  
Nomina ponto.*

If you must have an aerial flight wait till wings have grown on your own shoulders. You tell me you have a new theory which will be of vast service, indeed you dont see the extent of it, it is so large : well go on in secret and unravel the mystery. O that would require a long time, and all that time the world will want the use of it. I will publish it to the church, and improve it by the objections and suggestions of others : and then, if it is found worth nothing, or per-



nicious, I shall retract it. Will you? In the name of your Lord, how dare you throw into the midst of his church this unknown thing? What if it should turn out some monstrous hydra, and devour the sons of men? And though somebody, though yourself should at last slay the monster, will that resuscitate those whom it has devoured?

You tell me that you see something dimly twinkling through the mist, on the field of Christianity, and you promise yourself a discovery, but it is difficult. I ask, did you go out to look for difficulties, that you might have the glory of ranking with discoverers? Then the devil must have been your guide. And yonder he is, in that dim light, and as you advance it will grow brighter and brighter, and carry you on farther and farther, now towards this point of the compass, and now towards that, till at last, if divine grace interpose not, down it goes, and down you go in some Serbonian bog. Did you challenge the fiend, or did the fiend challenge you? If you challenged, mind you must fight the battle without a second. You'll be beaten, and killed too, unless some one comes by, and rescues you out of his hands. But did the fiend meet you at your master's work, and clutch you? then you must buckle to, your master has pitted his own blood against Satanic powers; himself for your second; let no one hear your voice but him; and be cool. And if the field be the philosophy of Christianity, long and dubious will this conflict be: and bitterly shalt thou bleed, and mournfully shalt thou groan, and dolefully shalt thou call on thy master for help. And when all thy veins are sluiced, and thou liest wallowing in thy own blood, and all thy joints dislocated, and every bone in thy body broken: in the last deadly grasp of desperate deter-

mination, just as the film begins to cover thy eye, thy master will give the victory. And thou shalt find thyself far stronger and sprightlier than when thou commencedest the conflict: a very feeble thing in thine own eyes, but thy master will be glorious in thy eyes. Thou wilt never desire such another conflict: though thou wilt not decline it on receiving thy master's orders. For now experience has assured thee that he will stand thy second, and in all his battles bring thee off more than conqueror.

## SECTION XI.

But, reader, I must now *look to myself*, for I am not sufficiently philanthropic to love every body but myself. After this long and laborious day's work, in reaping, and threshing, and winnowing, what have I got to myself, as *my wages*? Why, reader, here it is! just two pickles of chaff! Mr. M'Chord put them together according to the forms and ceremonies of the metaphysical community, and they have begotten a third pickle; and by and by intermarriages will take place, and marriages such as Cæsar describes in a certain island, and the earth will be replenished with them.

I say I have gotten two pickles of chaff for my share of the spoils—two sophistries of false philosophy, which the devil had mixed in the Lord's field of wheat. Here they are—That Adam's sin is imputed to man, BECAUSE *they descend from him by ordinary generation*—And that Christ's righteousness is imputable to men, BECAUSE *he represented them in the covenant of grace*.

The gospel of Jesus Christ teaches, that God *does* impute Adam's sin to his posterity : and that God *does* impute the righteousness of his Son to believers : and that he offers that righteousness to all men, promising eternal life to every man who receives it by faith, and threatening eternal death to all who reject it.

This is the gospel ; I have added nothing to it. I sucked it from the blessed breasts of the Holy Spouse of God when I was a babe. And now that I am a man, shall I permit any one to stain those blessed breasts with bitter poisonous drugs, to cause the babes to turn away with nausea ? or if in fainting hunger they must have milk, shall I permit the bitter poison to mingle with that milk, and throw their tender bodies into convulsions ? And shall any fear of any thing that man can do, deter me from washing it away in the very best manner and most effectual way that I can devise ? Oh, no ! mother—such is not thy son ; No ! babes—such is not thy brother !

Reader, thou and I lie chained in the same dungeon, under sentence of death, to be hanged on the same tree ; there is no appeal, for the sentence is pronounced by the Supreme Judge of the universe. There is no escaping hence, for our keeper is omniscient—and there can be no rescue, for the executioner is omnipotent. And is it not very foolish, and very wicked in us to be thus breaking each other's heads with the very chains which we wear, disputing about *how* that judge can be just in pronouncing that sentence ?

But, reader, here is a strange thing ! The Son of the King himself has just come into our dungeon with a lamp which makes it brighter than day. And he tells us that he has given himself to be hanged on the same



tree that we were to have been hanged on, in consequence of an agreement between him and the King his Father, that if he would so die he should have a right to come into our prison, and offer us life ; and he promises that if we follow him, he will treat us as his own brothers, and the King his Father will treat us as his own sons ; we shall wear the very same robes he wears himself ; we shall sit at the same table, and eat the same food with himself ; that wherever he goes he will take us with him, that he will give us a share of all his honours, and that when he triumphs, we shall triumph with him ; and that this sort of life shall continue through all eternity.

Reader, shall we take him at his word, and go along with him ? That open, honest brow bespeaks him no deceiver ; that indescribable eye beams only with benevolence ; such lips as those never could utter a falsehood ; Reader, arise, and let us follow him !

Or say, shall we sit down, and keep him standing, and waiting our leisure, while we cross question him ? Let us ask him—What right had you to die for us ? Was it just in the King your Father to impute our sins to you, and put you to death for us ? How can he impute your righteousness to us, and give us all the fine things you promise, because you died on the tree on which we were condemned to die ? Remember, Sir, we are rational creatures, every thing ought to be made visible to rational understandings. And if you can satisfy us on these points, we pledge ourselves to go with you—provided, always, that no new objection should occur. Reader, is this the way to go to work ?

O reader, all that is preached from our pulpits is not the gospel. I wish that one half of it may be



found gospel in the judgment day. I cannot get out of this subject.

My leg is broken, run and call a physician. He seats himself gravely by my agonizing couch, and thus begins. "Before I bind up this broken bone, I must first thoroughly satisfy thee concerning all the possible ways, and means, and manners in which bones can possibly be broken! In the first place, then, some men fall and break their own bones; and, in the second place, some men fall and break their own bones, and other people's bones too. O reader, it is a tearful jest; and I laugh, and I weep, alternately, over my paper.

Is not this precisely what we are doing, preaching dissertations how bones can be broken? How it was possible that Adam broke his own bones, and broke our bones. It is not pressing home on sinners their guilt—but explaining *how* they came to be guilty, that engages us. What matter *how* they became guilty, since they are so?

Let us dismiss the quack, and call a good physician, if we should not mistake the mere title of a professional man, for real professional talent.

Dear Doctor, my leg is broken; the pain is excruciating; cure me quickly. Sir, before I proceed to the cure, it is necessary that I inform thee how broken legs are healed. I care nothing about *how* they are healed. Heal my broken leg. You must know that the human bone is composed—I know nothing about its composition. You ought to know this much, at least, that out of the sides of the fracture of a fractured bone—Be-gone, I'll be a dead man before this dissertation is ended. Go quickly, and call a physician who actually has set a broken bone.

Here sir, is a physician, who says he has healed

many broken bones. Dear Doctor, here's my leg. Let me have it. A dreadful compound fracture; but my life for yours not mortal; only trust. There's the remedy that never did fail, and never will fail, so long as there are men on earth. The remedy is applied; the bone is healed.

Reader, is not this the right way of doing business? Convince men that they are (no matter *how* they are) sinners; and depend upon it, when they are convinced that they *are* sinners, the thought is so absorbing, that it leaves only one other thought in the whole compass of the human soul—*What shall I do to be saved?* Answer that question, for pity's sake, as quick as you can.

I cannot get out of this subject yet. But as I am preaching to clergymen, the public, I hope, will excuse my lengthiness. The clergy will not take it amiss. They know the Jordan sometimes overflows its banks.

Fellow-soldiers, the fiend has out-generated us. We are entirely in the wrong. He has kept us a great deal of our time preaching for his interest, and not for the interest of Jesus Christ. I mean we have been preaching something which is not the gospel; and which has as effectually served the devil's interests, as preaching the gospel subserves the interest of the Redeemer; and we have been doing the former while we should have been doing the latter.

Tell me how sinners' souls are exercised, all the time a preacher is showing how it could be just in God, to commit the eternal safety of mankind to Adam? How it can be just in God to punish them for the guilt in Adam? By what possible means, and through what possible channels could Adam's transgression reach

them? Why, they sit asking themselves these questions, which their preacher is in vain attempting to solve. How could it be just in God to make Adam my covenant head? How could Adam sin for me? How can God impute Adam's sin to me? Through what possible channel could Adam's sin reach me? What is the amount of all this on the mind of a sinner? Recollect how you felt yourself, when as a sinner you heard these things. Ask any candid man who is not of your sect, how he feels under such sermons. And what will be better than all, as a test of this matter, ask your own heart how it feels. Is it softened? is it melted with a conviction of its sinful condition? No, no! But it is lost in stupid wonder: wondering how it is possible that these things can be true, which God has declared to be true. Now, if exciting doubts and wonders respecting the truth of God's word, and the justice of the divine dispensations, be subservient of Satan's kingdom, judge ye!

But there is a far, far more loudly crying sin to answer for. When the preacher is giving him a long dissertation; shewing him exactly *how* it is possible that God can offer him everlasting life—the poor trembling convict, wringing his hands, cries out aloud, I do not ask *how* it is possible—but I ask, does he offer it to me? When the preacher is proving to him, and showing to him in what *manner* the righteousness of Christ can be imputed to him, his bursting soul exclaims, I ask not in what *manner* it may be mine, but can I get it at all? While the preacher is proving, by a metaphysical process, that eternal life *may be* offered to all men, in a perfect consistency with all the divine perfections and purposes of Jehovah, the poor convict's soul cries within itself, I don't care about all that



—is there any offer of salvation for me? All this time not one word of the gospel has been preached; and the poor afflicted souls are all the time lost in doubts and wonders, HOW IT IS POSSIBLE that Jesus Christ should have suffered for them:—HOW God could possibly impute their sins to his own Son:—HOW IT IS POSSIBLE that an offer of salvation should be made to him? That is, he is tortured with questions about God's right to give salvation—Christ's right to procure salvation, and the preacher's right to offer salvation, and his own right to accept salvation; but all this time there is no salvation at all. All this time Satan looks on, rejoices that the salvation of the convict is delayed—delights in the torments of his conscience—rejoices that possibilities have been talked of, and not realities: that rights have been only demonstrated; but the thing to which the right is proved, not put into the possession of him who has a right to it: exults to see that it is considered so far a dubious point, that it requires proof that the preacher has any right at all to offer salvation: and the poor creature is led to awful doubts, whether he has any right to accept of eternal life. Now I ask, is not this doing the very thing the devil would wish you to do? If he can keep you out of pulpits, he will. If he cannot, what can he do better than to employ you in discussions which will delay the coming of the sinner to Christ—which will fill his mind with doubts about his right to come to Christ—which will call in question, whether Christ will receive him, and the Father accept him? All such discussions before a Christian congregation, (with very, very, very rare exceptions) are, What is the USE of the doctrine of Adam's representation and original sin? Aye, what is the *use* of this doctrine in the grand arch



of the rainbow of the covenant. For surely it is one thing to say a proposition is true, and another to determine what that truth is good for. The doctrine of Adam's representation and original sin is in the Bible ; but the question is, What was it put there for, and what use ought we to put it to? Here are a few elements which I mean to make use of in solving this question, for my own individual satisfaction.

1. I will ask myself, if ever any prophet, sent by God, of old, to awaken a sinful age, awed their consciences, and enlightened their understanding, by demonstrating Adam's representative character, and proving that mankind are guilty of his sin? Or did they thunder against the sins, the actual, the peculiar sins of that very age; ardently wishing to convince men that they were sinners?

2. I shall enquire into John the Baptist's preaching, and examine how he, who came to prepare the way of our Lord, thundering the law, that Jesus might flash the light of the gospel—how he produced correction in that viperous age, when the tongue that uttered truth, sacrificed the head it belonged to. Was it by preaching the representative character of Adam and original sin: or by reproving men for their sins, their own sins, their peculiar sins, with all their aggravations?

3. I shall again read over carefully, the sermons of the master himself, who knew perfectly well how to preach his own gospel; and if I find him proving Adam's representative character, and urging home original sin on the consciences of his auditors, and proving to them that God is just in all this, then the problem will be solved. Or if I find him charging home on the age, the sins which that age had committed,

and were committing, then the problem will be solved. He himself was living law.

4. I shall next enquire how the Apostles, in the days of Pentecost, awakened sinners to a sense of their guilt.

5. I shall enquire what is the meaning of some strange things that we meet with, in the writings of some good old authors ; and have often heard from the lips of some good old men ; that original sin is the last sin men are convinced of.

These and some other enquiries I intend to make, will afford me a satisfaction as to what the doctrines of Adam's representation and original sin are not useful. If I find, on enquiry, that they are never once employed by the sacred inspired ambassadors of the skies, in awakening a guilty, perishing age, from the fatal security, to a sense of their sins, and a sacred terror of Jehovah's wrath, then shall I conclude, that these doctrines are of no use in awakening sinners, and bringing them to Jesus.

Ah ! cries some prudent, cautious man, take care ! This may excite a suspicion that that doctrine is not true, or at least, that you doubt its being useful. Well, since men must have their suspicions, let them suspect what they please. I tell them, and I tell those who deny the doctrine, that it is in the Bible. But the question is, to what end is it there ? What purposes does it serve ? Here is a stone ; well, what is the use of it—To place in a building—to cut for a seal—to set in a ring ? What is it good for ?

I have as good a right to trouble the church of God as others have. And I will give this trouble to the brains of ministers, in order to save a great deal of trouble to the souls of their people. I will propose this

problem to them—*What is precisely the use which the sacred writers make of the doctrine of Adam's representation and original sin?*

Till this problem is solved, let them labour to convince sinners that they are sinners. No great matter *how* they came to be such, since they actually are so, and under an awful doom. And the moment they confess guilt, invite them to Jesus. When they are once safe in his securing arms, they can ask him many things as they lean on his bosom. He will teach every day more and more of the wickedness of their desperately wicked nature; and perhaps may lead them up to view the desperate wickedness of the whole race of men, and to see something respecting Adam's representative character. But they are his, and don't trouble them with puzzling problems. If they cannot see that they are guilty of Adam's—caution them only *not to deny* the doctrine, to repent of their own sins, and rely on the grace of their Lord.

When the above problem is resolved, the resolver will have a right to propose his question; and will greatly oblige me if he proposes the following: *What is the precise use which the sacred writers make of the doctrine of election, and of Christ's representation?*

One thing has long been ascertained, that it is not the doctrine which should be taught to poor trembling convicts under a sense of the displeasure of the Awful Supreme.

## SECTION XII.

*The reason why eternal life is offered to all men in the Gospel.*

That salvation is freely offered to all men who hear the gospel—and that every individual man who hears the gospel, is commanded to accept that salvation, under the pains and penalty of everlasting condemnation, in case of a refusal—are truths so obviously taught in the Holy Scriptures, that one wonders how any human being should ever have entertained a doubt on the subject.

Those, however, who believe in the doctrine of election—who believe that Jesus Christ died to save a certain number of mankind, have been repeatedly and sorely pressed to assign a cause for offering salvation to the unelected, which should vindicate the moral candour and justice of Jehovah. And so long as they maintained that the *imputability* of Christ's righteousness depended on his *representative* characters in the covenant of grace—so long, I humbly conceive, their answer was unsatisfactory. We ought to speak freely and openly to our brothers of Adam's family; and in this spirit I do declare, that I never could be satisfied with the current explanations.

And yet nothing can be more certain, than that God is candid, true, and just, in this offer of life to mankind in general: And we can *see* and *know* that all his moral attributes stand clear of imputation in this offer. Nay, we shall attempt to show that all his moral attributes required that he should make such an



offer of salvation to all mankind. We shall show that God is not only just in this general offer, but that he would not have been just not to give it to all, provided he thought proper to give it to any.

In surveying such a statue as the Apollo Belvidere, one artist may be most struck with this profile, and another with that; while all admit that it is a miracle of art. In like manner, different men contemplating the general call of the gospel may be differently affected. One may view it as a merciful act in God so to offer life to offenders: another may consider it as some unaccountable mystery, which he is sure God can unravel, though he owns that he cannot. Now I must say, that this general offer of salvation to all men by Jesus Christ, never appears to me so glorious as when it is placed under the direct beam of pure justice. My meaning is this, that if God reveals the righteousness of Christ to mankind, he *must* command them to accept it: and that he would not be a just God if he did not so command them.

The reasoning is as follows: God does require of all men the righteousness of the law. It must be so; for if he did not require this, he could require nothing, and all moral law, moral order, moral responsibility, would be at an end. God requires the righteousness of the law; but the gospel reveals the righteousness of Christ as the righteousness of the law; of consequence, God requires men to present to him the righteousness of Christ. Christ's righteousness is the righteousness of the law: but God requires the righteousness of the law; therefore God requires the righteousness of Christ of every man who hears the gospel sound. Can any thing be plainer? But let us turn it

round and around, and again *dicies repetita placehit*; our admiration will increase with acquaintance.

Suppose God did not require men to present to him the righteousness of his Son—then he would not require them to present the righteousness of his law—that is, he would release them from the obligation of the moral law altogether. Is this possible! Then our high born race, made only *for a little while* lower than the angels, this glorious race, created in the image of God, must rank with the beasts that perish; no moral law, no moral order, no moral pleasure, no moral reward! Such a state of things is inconceivable.

The only possible evasion that the subtlest logician could avail himself of in order to keep clear of this conclusion is, the allegation that God might require men *personally* to work out the righteousness of the law, and refuse to allow them the righteousness of the Son. It is proper to treat such subjects with great modesty and fear. Who can say what Jehovah may or may not do? Who shall set limits to the Holy One of Israel? But I cannot conceive the supposition stated, to be at all worthy of God. The justice of God is the justice of a Being of infinite goodness, kindness, mercy—of infinite equity. And can I suppose that such a Being should require *a righteousness which is not in the world*; and refuse *a righteousness which is in the world*? Can it be supposed that he should say, I demand the righteousness of the law—here is the righteousness of the law—but I do not demand it.

Culling from the analogies of human things with divine, let me suppose the following case. My brother was under a contract, to effect a piece of work, and to receive ten thousand dollars on its completion, or pay a fine of ten thousand dollars in case of fail-

ure. He fails to effect the work, and must pay the forfeit. If now I come forward, and pay down the ten thousand dollars to the original contractor, saying my brother has failed, but I am able to pay all his debts ; what should I think or say of that contractor, if he were to refuse the money, and cast my brother into prison, under an allegation that I was not known in the original contract?

I would not push analogies too far, on so vast and awful a theme. If I rightly understand the Scriptures, it is an act of grace in God to accept a *vicarious*, instead of a personal righteousness ; and yet the Scriptures do not intimate that God would be just in rejecting the righteousness of the law, when presented to him. Let justice, equity and love, then, entwine their unfading glories ! Let others view matters in that light which is afforded them ; but for my single self, I must say, that if the righteousness of God's law is in the world, he wills to be satisfied with it ! What does he ask ? The righteousness of his law. Does he ask more of me, or less of me ? Neither less nor more. And can I imagine that the Father of all mercies, and God of all consolations, the Father of this spirit, and the fashioner of this mortal body, will show me the real righteousness of his law, already wrought out and finished, and demand of me, not to accept this righteousness, but to work out a righteousness of his own, which he knows I cannot do ?

There is something in the human mind, like an enlarged intuition, a sort of vision, which is blind to the slow steps of verbal logic, but perceives with assurance, what is in the main truth : and that intuition, or whatever it is, seems to assure me that if my elder brother is both able and willing to pay my debt ; my

heavenly Father will not refuse to accept his due, merely because it is not I, but my elder brother, that has earned it with sweat and toil. Nay, when I stand before him, trembling for my doom, I think I hear him saying to me, your elder brother is both able and willing to pay your debt : nothing would give him greater pleasure : bid him settle for you. Such, I must think, is something like the sentiments of the Father of us all. I cannot see how such a glorious Jehovah should proclaim salvation among his own creatures, the work of his own hands, and not command them to accept it.

A half-bred metaphysician is a wonderful enchanter : he lives in the middle of a great world of words. If you get in you will never get out, unless you draw your axe, and cut your way. Let me see. This same word *representation*, sounds to my ear very like *gravitation*. Old father Newton has demonstrated that bodies really and truly do gravitate, but if you ask him the cause, he sends you to the poets  $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\prime$   $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\ \beta\omicron\delta\eta\kappa$ —it is the will of God : and all his sons vote with their old father. What short cuts these philosophers take of us ! We call for *reasons*, for *causes*, for *hows* and *whys*, and they with most provoking gravity give us *facts*, plain naked *facts*, and nothing but *facts*. The *fact* occurs in nature, that's all. They have thrown away all this learned vocabulary of sounds about *occult principles*, and what not, and are content with the ascertainment of facts. And since they have acted in this manner their work goes on cheerily. It is amazing how they advance. An old hoary headed philosopher will have to ask his own son, before the lad is allowed to give a vote at an election, what the present state of science is. Certainly



the philosophers have got on the right track ; they get along so rapidly. If they could only be kept from making worlds, it is impossible to say with what brilliancy science would shortly blaze.

Now it is to be hoped, that as soon as divines become philosophers, in the true sense of the word, their work will advance in the same rapid felicitous manner. Whenever that day comes, they will know that in respect to imputation of sin and righteousness in the covenant of works, all that can be known is the *fact* : That in respect to the *reasonableness* of that dispensation, all that can be known is that *infinite reason* established it : that in respect to its *justice*, nothing can be known, save that *Jehovah the source of all justice*, has done it. If this will satisfy mankind, the preachers of the gospel can satisfy them with undoubted scriptural authority. And if that will not satisfy them, why let the worms crawl on their throne, and call their maker to account for having made them thus. He will trample them in his wrath—unless his bowels should yearn, and then he will give them a new heart and new mind ; and they will acknowledge that he has done all things well. If any one imagines that he ever will know any reason why God created our race to be saved or damned, by the imputed righteousness, or imputed sin of a representative, let me hasten to cure him of his delirium ; let me give him a lethean draught, that he may forget his terrene follies, and reconcile himself to his fate. This is the medicine of the mind.

Isa. 45, ix. &c. “ Woe unto him that striveth with his maker ! Let the potsherds strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, what makest thou ? Or thy work, He

hath no hands ? Woe unto him that saith unto his father, what begettest thou ? or to the woman, what hast thou brought forth ?”

✚ “ Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker. Ask me of things to come concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands, command ye me ! ! !”

I had thought to have paraphrased this passage : but I can't touch it. Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without wisdom ? If you can see—see : If not, I can do no more.

### SECTION XIII.

Those among men, who are devoted to high intellectual efforts, may be divided into two classes, the students of *nature*, and the students of *grace*, *philosophers* and *divines*.

“ One sire begat them, and one mother bore !” And sorry I am, when I see any fraternal strife among them. Could they but agree, they would soon kick out of the world the bastard breed of sceptics, infidels, and atheists.

After all, the *divines* are of the nobler family. But the philosophers have, as yet, played the man in the higher style. Their scale goes down to the ground with a most ponderous gravity ; while our scale kicks the beam, as if there was nothing in it. What can be the reason that for two centuries, less or more, *philosophy* should be making such prodigious advances, and *divinity* standing stock still ?

Look, ye divines, at your twin brothers ! There is one, with his crucible in one hand, and his thermome-

ter in the other—covered all over with sweat and cinders—a true son of Vulcan, putting nature to the torture, to compel her to reveal some of her secrets. Look up ! there is one of them scrambling to the very top of the Andes ! Now I would not be along side of him for all beneath the sun. What does the fellow mean ? Is he going to get a tenement among the stars ? No ! he is a philosopher, and bye and bye he will come down, (if he should not break his neck) and will bring in his pocket some lichens and mosses, and pebbles : and when he gets his brothers about him, you will wonder to hear what conclusions they will draw, conclusions which excite the sneer of ridicule only in countenances where the lambent smile of wisdom never played. Look there ! just at your feet, there is one of them going perpendicularly down to the shades, through the shaft of a horrible mine-hole : before fifteen minutes he will be fifty fathoms into the very bowels of the earth, among pitfalls, and choak damps ; and the earth every moment threatening to cave in on his head.

Well, are all these men fools ? No. They are students of nature ; and they mind their books. What is the result ? Behold what the God of nature has given them as the reward of their devotion and industry. Tell any one of these blades that you have got a new *theory* ; he laughs in your face ; and asks you where are your facts ? From that family theories have long been banished.

But how is it in the other family—among the theologians ? What have you been doing all this time ? What have you discovered for a few centuries ? Just nothing. Did you mind your books—the books of the sacred volume—these are your books—did you mind

them? If you had, I am sure the God of grace is not so niggardly of his favours, as to refuse you some game for your hunting. The Bible, the Bible, cried Chillingworth, is the religion of Protestants. And any one who pleases, may cry, the Bible, the Bible, is the world of the theologian. Don't be mistaken. The Bible is not explored. There is many a *terra australis incognita*, in that moderate volume. And until theologians place themselves for life on the holy page, we shall have no discoveries! Perhaps some may have worn epaulets for seven years, and never measured, with the line in his hand, a single encampment: perhaps a man may have been seven years a minister of the gospel, and never have analysed a single book of the sacred volume, nor expounded it to his flock. How can there be divines in this way of working?

The philosophers are playing the men. Nothing in the heavens above, or in earth below, can escape them. Not a star can show its head, but they will know something about it. Not a substance in nature but they will find some use for. All this is as it ought to be. But how goes the day among the divines? What are they doing? What single thing has been done by them now, for centuries, to purify the church's faith, and bring her up in all things, to the purity of the sacred model. Are not all the systems of false philosophy, that ever corrupted the church of God, in full vigour, corrupting it still? Are there not as many parties in the Christian church, as ever there were, with their jarring doctrines, and mutual contradictions? And what are the divines doing? they are very gravely looking on, and leaving it to one metaphysician, to destroy the theory of another metaphysician. That much is easily done; he tears one system down, and builds up another; and thus leaves



the world as well off as he found it. The metaphysicians will never be able to do this work, they will never, to all eternity, produce a good moral theory. God reserves that work for his own sons of the holy anointing oil; and they will come forth with the holy sword of the spirit, and jugulate these human sophistries: and preach the gospel just as they find it in their Bible. And then the world will enjoy a good system, as fine a theory as ever infinite wisdom devised.

“O mihi tam longæ maneat pars ultima vitæ  
Spiritus et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta.”

But the sigh is in vain! A new generation must arise in the Christian church—the race of *commentators*. The world is just ready for them. The pioneers have cleared the way. They have rummaged every monk's cell; they have dusted every little tatter of a manuscript which contained so much as one jot, or one tittle of the sacred volume. They have put them into the hands of the Bible critics, who have weighed each one of these jots and tittles, with as much scrupulosity as if their everlasting all were at stake. They have given us the sacred volume, as complete and as pure, as we expect ever to get it. But now we want a race of men to search the Scriptures, and tell us exactly what they contain. Whenever the church beholds her sons studying the sacred books, with the same ardour, assiduity, and perseverance, which the philosophers are now displaying on the book of nature, she will find herself already reformed; her wrinkles all gone; and herself restored to the virgin beauty of her youth.

The Christian church does need a race of philosophical ministers. But they must be philosophers of

the right kind—not system-makers. but system-breakers ; true iconoclasts every man of them.

---

## CONCLUSION.

Reader, I did not trouble thee with a long introduction of myself to thy acquaintance. But after having travelled so long in thy company, it would give me some pain, to think that thou hast no curiosity to learn what induced me to become thy companion. In plain terms, I may reasonably be asked, what induced me to write this book. To which question I would make the following reply.

That I strongly suspect, that some of the ideas contained in this book, would at one time or another, have made their way to the public, under some shape and form. But entertaining an opinion, that if the Father of lights reveals any thing to any man, with an intention that it should ultimately be communicated to the world, he will at one time or another, give a providential call to that man to speak out ; I was in no haste to obtrude myself upon the public notice. But when Mr. M'C.'s book (*THE BODY OF CHRIST*,) came to my hand, I suspected the time was come when I ought to speak out. I accordingly cat-lugged several of his pages for reference, and took up my pen. But when I recollected that I had reasons, peculiar to myself, why I should be the last man in the world to bear hard on a youth, who, in pursuit of what he esteemed truth, had the misfortune to come into collision with Presbyteries and Synods ; and when I considered, that since the Synod was yet to pass judgment in the

case, it might be that God had prepared some others to plead his cause, far better than I could do ; the pen dropped from my hand : neither head, nor heart, nor hand, would move in the business.

During the time that Mr. M'C.'s appeal was under discussion in the Synod, I never once entered the house ; but I was often asked my opinion, by several of the members. Of Mr. M'C. I had as favourable an opinion as any of them : of his system, I thought worse than they all. I freely offered my weapons to different members : but no one would have them. Some seemed to doubt their goodness ; and I could not teach their use to any body.

The Synod eventually confirmed the sentence of *suspension*, passed on Mr. M'C. by the Presbytery of Kentucky, on account of his doctrines. But I was informed by every man who attended the debates, that they did not at all refute Mr. M'C. ; nor demonstrate *wherein* he was wrong ; but acted entirely on the defensive. They did not strike the Redeemer's flag, but neither did they fire an offensive gun. I do not mention this by way of reflection upon that venerable court ; but only as a reason to justify my own procedure, in having troubled the world with the present publication. Mr. M'C. protested against the Synod's decision, and appealed to churches better informed, and to the public at large ; and handed me, among others, a copy of his plea.

It was then the trumpet sounded its loudest charge. Ezek. xxxiii. 1. &c.—“ Again the word of the Lord came unto me saying, son of man, speak unto the children of thy people, and say unto them, when I bring the sword upon a land, if the people of the land take a man of their coasts, and set him for their watchman : if

when he seeth the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet and warn the people ; then whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning, if the sword come and take him away, his blood shall be upon his own head ; he heard the sound of the trumpet, and took not warning. His blood shall be upon him. But he that taketh warning shall deliver his soul. But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned ; if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity, *but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand !*"

" So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel ; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me !"

Just then I found myself ready, and sprung into the field with what armour I had : how I have acted, let people judge ; but let no man ask me farther why I am here.

In respect to the manner of communication, I dis-embarrassed myself of all the solemn formalities of authorship. And seating myself in my chair, poured my thoughts along, in whatever drapery they thought proper to bring with them. 'This I am sure is the easiest way for an author to express his thoughts, in the natural order and series in which they spring up in his own mind ; and I strongly suspect, that thoughts expressed in this manner, will appear more perspicuous and natural to the reader, than those which are forced into the attitudes and dress of a more technical rhetoric. The real truth, however, is, that it was my own ease I studied.

Perhaps some very grave people may complain that there is too much pleasantry in these pages. With-



out presuming to sit on the jury which is to try myself, I would make this simple remark: that I hope it is all of the genuine sort—all of the family of benevolence. Is there a single sentence that can wound the honourable feelings, or hurt the honest fame of any one man, alive or dead? If I thought there was, I would throw my book, now nearly printed off, into the fire, and my pen after it. Is there any thing to disparage the fair pretensions of any one human being? It has *escaped* me. But since controversial theology has dealt so largely in bitterness and wrath, in sly inuendoes, and tart speeches, was it not worth the trouble of an experiment, whether it might not be seasoned equally well with good humour? But if any man should think that ridicule, fairly and honestly applied, is not a weapon forged, tempered and polished by the spirit of God, and destined to gleam on fields where no other weapon would be of any use; let that man read the 44th chapter of Isaiah, and tell me whether the eagle of the Jewish church was an owl.

The extreme rapidity with which this work has passed under the pen, and under the press, must expose it to just criticism, in respect to the delicate graces of classical composition. I am still more afraid that the same cause may subject it to the censure of occasionally dropping a link in the chain of accurate demonstration. Perhaps, however, some readers will be apt to think, that there is a surplus, an exuberance of proof. And I wish they may think so. It was, however, with every intention in the world, that this plentitude of argument was employed. The general doctrine is of immense importance, and draws after it a train of consequences so vast and momentous, that it became a most imperative duty to place it in a great

variety of lights and attitudes ; that those who could not approve it in one, might perhaps approve it in another.

Perhaps some of those who are fonder of contemplating modesty in others, than of practising it themselves, may think that the general tone is too decisive ; and that where ideas are exhibited so different from those of so many great and good men, a little hesitation and faltering of speech would have been more becoming. I do assure such, that wherever I had any hesitation, I have expressed it ; and where I had no hesitation, I of course had none to express. Surely hypocritical humility is no great virtue, in either man or author ! Surely when a man ventures to address the church of God, on the awful subject of her eternal hope, there is something more at stake than his reputation with the public. Has God authorised us to utter his truth in such faltering accents, as may teach the world that we hardly believe it ourselves ?

If the public should see cause to condemn the doctrine herein advanced, I cannot, with truth, and therefore I shall not at all, either in this world or in the next, plead youthful indiscretion as an apology for the error. Boy, and youth, and man, must all go down together. I trod the listed field at first, on all my *personal responsibility*. I have trodden it now publicly, on all my *social responsibility*. This must suffice.

And since these doctrines **MUST** be mine, I give the world fair notice ; that whatever strictures may be made upon them, by either tongue or pen, I shall preserve not a sullen cynical silence, but I trust a meek and resigned christian silence. I have thought the cause, and argued the cause as well as I could ! That's all.

Some readers will probably have sagacity enough to perceive, that if the views of divine things herein exhibited, be correct, they lead to practical conclusions of the most sweeping kind ; and, perhaps, terrified at these practical conclusions, they may struggle against the principles. I am candid enough to declare, that I mean to support all those practical conclusions ; and to an extent which few of my readers can at all conjecture. This shall be done, by divine permission, in the second part of this treatise.

I present this little treatise to my Lord, a small, (such my dove-cotes afford,) but a very sincere thank-offering, for his kindness in showing me something of his truth.

I lay at the feet of my mother, the church, a few sophisms, wrung from the fiend, by the least of all her sons, after a long conflict on that bloody field :—fed only with her milk, armed only with the panoply divine, encouraged only by my Lord. A thousand times my helmet was cleft in twain, and I lay stunned and bleeding ; till he set me on my feet, healed my wound, put on a new helmet, and set me to again. I lay them at her feet ; and *Wo ! Wo ! Wo !* to the man who shall give them back into his hand, to stab her and her babes.

I present it to those men whom God has appointed to rid his church of false philosophy, as a proof of ardent love, and high ambition to be among them.

*Atque utinam ex vobis unus, vestrique, fuisset  
Aut custos gregis, aut maturæ vinitor uvæ !*

I present it to Mr. M'C. as a proof that there is, at least, one man in the world, who will neither abuse

him, nor persecute him ; nor yet condemn him with a silent vote : but who will step into the field of investigation, and try to put him right. And now I do insist that he shall read this work over and over ; and weigh it thoroughly : that he shall not object to any little trifling matters, which he may think, and which probably are, wrong ; but that he shall try to grasp the main argument ; and if that be correct, let him acquiesce. Let him lay a reign on his impetuosity, and not draw a quill in reply for twelve months. A single act of rashness, and he's gone !

I present this little work to system-makers, to show them how very easy it is to create a great deal of trouble in this world of ours. If it requires so much toil to pull down a system, how immense must be the toil of building one !

I present it to young theologians, as a specimen of the cool and cautious manner in which divine truth ought to be investigated. For their sakes, I wish it were far less imperfect than it is. But such as it is, I must present it to them as such a specimen : and not a single nerve of mine will feel a thrill of mortification, should somebody antiquate my labours, by producing a more perfect specimen to-morrow.

And now it shall be my joy, that I have got this field to myself. In the social ranks I could have done nothing. All my fine selected positions would have been denied me ; and the only weapons on which I trusted, would have been wrung from my hands, by my brother's arms.

To close the whole ; I have consulted my heart, and am sure that no offence to any human being has been *intended* in this publication. I have consulted my best judgment, and am told that no reasonable ground of



offence *has been given*. But if, after all, I must suffer—my fortitude whispers in my ear; I have supported you under ten times worse evils than can come, incurred for ten times less than no offence, and I shall never forsake you in a good cause! Here, at least, I shall not be deceived. My motto is

ἡ ἰφί μαχεσθαι ἢ ἀπολλωναι

The opinions of men, their criticisms, their censures, and their applause, are, in reality, very little things. Their love, and their hatred, and their envy, will shortly have perished; neither will they have any more a portion, for ever, in any thing that is done under the sun. But divine truth—she trieth all things, and is herself tried of none; she judgeth all, and is herself judged of none: times and seasons change, the opinions and doctrines, and systems of men revolve through endless mutations; but divine truth remains through all ages and generations immutable, the pure essential ray of the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, nor shadow of turning.

ΤΩ ΘΗΩ ΔΟΞΑ

END OF THE FIRST PART.



## POSTSCRIPT.

IN page 1, of the introduction, 8th line from the bottom, it is said that Mr. M'C. was "*deposed* from the office of the holy ministry." This is an error; the sentence was "*suspension* from the exercise of his office."

Page 13, are the following words :—"The solution contemplated is, that Jesus did not descend from Adam by ordinary generation; and that as *ordinary* generation is the bond which unites us to Adam, the *extraordinary* generation of our Lord prevented a federal union with Adam; and acquitted him from any personal responsibility for Adam's conduct. And I acknowledge that this is the solution of the question given in the confessions, and catechisms, and formularies of all the Reformed Churches, and in the writings of the ablest divines." Such is the impression on my mind, from what I have read on the subject. It would be well worthy the labour of some one, fond of theological reading, to trace the growth of the doctrines of reformation, from their first germ; and then to trace their decline, and its causes. I strongly suspect, that such a man would bring to light some precious discoveries, respecting the causes which have given so much diversity to men's religious ideas, that one wonders sometimes whether all men be of the same species. Our religious opinions are strangely modified, by the philosophy, the superstitions, and the manners of our age. The common method of resolving a man's peculiar opinions into his pride, his love of fame, his enmity to the truth, &c. has two inconveniences, which

#### POSTSCRIPT.

render its practicable utility very questionable. The first of these inconveniences is, that it is equally capable of application in all cases, which would not leave an honest man on earth:—the second is, that we cannot be absolutely certain of its truth in any case.













FEB 7 - 1941

